100168

L200

THE RELATION

OF

CONFIRMATION TO BAPTISM

BY THE SAME AUTHOR.

THE FAITH OF THE GOSPEL

A Manual of Christian Doctrine.

Crown 8vo, 3s. 6d.

Also a Large-Paper Edition for Marginal Notes, 4to, 12s. 6d.

LONGMANS, GREEN, & CO., LONDON AND NEW YORK.

234.16
M398r

THE RELATION

OF

CONFIRMATION TO BAPTISM

AS TAUGHT IN HOLY SCRIPTURE AND THE FATHERS

BY

ARTHUR JAMES MASON D.D.

FORMERLY FELLOW OF TRINITY COLLEGE CAMBRIDGE

Donum Spiritus Sancti quod datur in baptismate per impositionem manus episcoporum.—PSEUDO-PRIMASIUS

SECOND EDITION

7098

LONDON
LONGMANS, GREEN, & CO.
AND NEW YORK: 15 EAST 16th STREET
1893

All rights reserved

BRITISH ISLES NAZARENE
LIBRARY
COLLEGE
WITHDRAWN

BRITISH ISLES NAZARENE
LIBRARY
COLLEGE
WITHDRAWN

TO A NAME

TOO VENERABLE AND TOO DEAR FOR ME TO ATTEMPT

TO SAY OF IT WHAT I WOULD

Edward

LORD ARCHBISHOP OF CANTERBURY

IN MEMORY OF MANY BLESSED CONFIRMATIONS

BEYOND THE TAMAR

WHEN I WAS HIS CHAPLAIN

PREFACE

That Doctrine of the Laying on of Hands, which appeared to the author of the Epistle to the Hebrews so fundamental, has, in spite of the clear language of the Prayer-book, been less strongly taught in England by the general body of the clergy, and perhaps less often worked at by theologians, than was desirable in the interest of true religion. Although there have been innumerable little publications of a practical kind, to aid pastors in preparing their people for Confirmation, it is a considerable time since any important volume has been devoted to the subject. Without constant re-examination in the light of former days, current teaching is always liable to lose something of the primitive power and clearness. The Bible, indeed, is always resorted to for the instruction of classes before Confirmation; but the Bible doctrine, plain as it is, is often misunderstood because, through a misleading tradition, the true relation

between Baptism and Confirmation has been obscured, and therefore the full force has not been allowed to the expressions concerning the second of the two baptismal acts. It is well, therefore, to turn to the history of the Church, and see what was felt by early Christian teachers in days subsequent to the close of the Canon, in order that, when we examine the literal meaning of the Scriptures upon the point, we may have some security that we are not interpreting those Scriptures in a modern fashion.

The student of this particular subject, in searching for references to the patristic teaching, naturally turns first to Daillé's attack upon the Roman doctrine of his day, in his treatise *De Confirmatione* (A.D. 1659). Daillé was answered on the Continent by James de Saintebeuve, the friend of the Port Royalists, whose work was printed by his brother after the author's death, in 1686, and by J. A. Assemani, in his *Codex Liturgicus*, vol. iii. (1750), and others; in England, by Henry Hammond, in his *De Confirmatione sive Benedictione post Baptismum Solenni* (1683). All three are valuable books. Upon the technical questions concerning the matter, form, and minister of Confirmation, the *De Synodo Dioecesana* (1758) of the most learned of

the modern Popes, Benedict XIV., is still useful. The most elaborate and extensive treatise upon the subject, however, is that ascribed to Charles Witasse, one of the Paris professors who resisted the bull Unigenitus. Witasse died in 1716, and the book was published in 1722 ; but the editors of Migne's *Theologiae Cursus Completus* (vol. viii. p. 10) say that it was by another hand, by an Oratorian father. It is printed, nevertheless, under the name of Witasse, in the twenty-first volume of the *Cursus*. Doctrinally, this treatise is poor, and far inferior to Saintebeuve, from whom much of its learning is derived. It is a relief to turn from arid discussions like these, of a controversial or of an antiquarian nature, to Hooker's chapter in the fifth book of his *Ecclesiastical Polity ;* and still more to Jeremy Taylor's "Χρίσις τελειωτική, a Discourse of Confirmation" (1663), by far the richest and most edifying work upon the subject with which I am acquainted. Bishop Hall's paper on Confirmation (1649), though devout, is meagre and slight. Of recent books, the best on the subject that I know is the beautiful *Dogmatische Lehre von den heiligen Sakramenten* of J. H. Oswald, of Braunsberg (4th edition 1877), which teaches the doctrine of the personal indwelling of the

Holy Spirit by means of Confirmation, with a firmness and force which leave nothing to be desired, and with a Christian reasonableness which only that indwelling could impart. In England the primitive doctrine has been well stated in a brief form by the late Mr. John Frere, in a book called *The Doctrine of Imposition of Hands; or Confirmation the ordained and ordinary means for conveying the Gift of the Holy Ghost* (1845); and by Mr. F. W. Puller, now of the Society of S. John the Evangelist, Cowley, in his little tract (1880), unhappily at present out of print, *What is the Distinctive Grace of Confirmation?* To Father Puller's kindness I owe it that I have been able to read the now scarce work of Saintebeuve, in a copy belonging to the library of his House. In the general works on Christian doctrine, Confirmation receives the best and worthiest treatment from Klee *Katholische Dogmatik* (2nd edition, 1841), Martinet *Institutiones Theologicae* (1859), and Friedhoff *Katholische Dogmatik* (2nd edition, 1875); and, to go further east, from Macarius, Bishop of Vinnitza and Rector of the Ecclesiastical Academy of S. Petersburg, whose *Théologie Dogmatique* (that is, in the French translation) bears date 1857. Most modern

Roman books on doctrine in general, for instance Perrone, Gousset, or Hurter, only reveal the sterility of traditional dogmatism in this matter.

I have not thought it needful to give in elaborate detail the history of opinion upon Confirmation since the close of the patristic period. The Holy English Church appeals always to Scripture interpreted by primitive antiquity, and I thought that it would weary the reader, without rewarding him, to carry the discussion later. A considerable number of the passages quoted in the following pages have not, so far as I know, been brought together before for the elucidation of the doctrine of Confirmation; and I have tried to examine more systematically than others have had occasion to do, the expressions of particular teachers, like S. Clement of Alexandria, and S. Austin, for example; and, in the appendices to the various chapters, the language of the most ancient baptismal Liturgies, to use that word with the latitude which Asseman vindicated for it. It is more than possible that I have overlooked some passages in the patristic writers which bear upon the point I am investigating, but I have not purposely omitted any. At the risk of being tedious, I have thought

it best to set forth at length all the materials which were within my knowledge, in order that every reader might easily judge for himself how the matter stands. My object is not controversial. I have wished to be especially careful to note any approach to the opinion prevalent in the modern English Church, that the indwelling gift of the Holy Ghost is bestowed in Baptism apart from Confirmation. That opinion begins to show signs of creeping into the Church in the West in the ninth century; but its absence from all previous teaching is most noticeable and suggestive. In the East. it is doubtful whether that opinion has ever crept in at all. So far as I am aware, the evidence on these points has never been systematically arranged in print before.

Questions of ritual, such as those debated between Sirmond and Aurelius upon the "matter" of Confirmation, and between the English Jesuits and the Sorbonne upon the "minister" and upon the relation between Confirmation and the baptismal unction, can be studied in Witasse or some other of the works which I have named; but it may clear the mind of the reader to be told that the name of Confirmation is only a Western name, and is not found until the fifth

century, and that in the Eastern authors, and the earlier Western ones, that which we understand by Confirmation is only described by its constituent acts or elements as parts of the order of Holy Baptism. From the earliest times after the close of the Canon of Scripture, there were three main acts in Baptism to which grace was thought to be attached. Pre-eminent amongst a host of symbolical ceremonies to which no such idea was attached, stand the baptismal Immersion, the subsequent Anointing, and the Imposition of Hands,—or, as it almost invariably appears in Latin, "of the Hand." In the West, these three always occupy the same order in relation to each other. Along with them appears, at first in a somewhat unsettled order with regard to the others, the signing of the forehead with the Cross. By the fifth century the signing or "sealing," had begun invariably to follow at once upon the Laying on of the Hand,—forming, in fact, but one gesture with it,—while the words of the ministrant in sealing made part of the same sentence in which he invoked the sevenfold Spirit to attend the Laying on of the Hand. Whether from the first this sealing was done with Chrism, or consecrated unguent, is not certain; at any rate it

was so from the time of Innocent I., in the case of persons who had been baptized without the bishop's presence, and probably in the case of all. When, therefore, the Fathers—especially the later ones—speak of Unction, or the Chrism, it is not always obvious which application of the anointing oil they refer to. At first, undoubtedly, the former was considered the more important; at a later time, the latter acquired from the circumstances of its employment the greater veneration, and even came to be regarded as the essential feature of the Laying on of Hands. In the East, except in the Egyptian Church, the Laying on of Hands, as a distinct rite, soon melted away, and the Unctions are more profusely administered. The "Seal" occupies the most prominent position.

Dr. Oswald says very truly (vol. i. p. 261):—"In the early Church, with regard to certain sacraments indistinct and confused ideas prevailed at times, because, although these means of grace were then administered and received with great earnestness, there was as yet no orderly and systematic theory of them. This remark applies in a high degree to our sacrament [Confirmation]. We find in the ancient authors many expressions with regard to Confirmation

which are now seldom heard. The title of it is variable, the information concerning the sacramental action indefinite, the description of its relation to Baptism often incorrect, so that it is no easy matter to make out exactly the meaning of particular Fathers with regard to this sacrament." But the matter is somewhat easier for us English Churchmen, who are not bound to prove that Confirmation is a separate sacrament. To us it is no incorrect description of the relation of Confirmation to Baptism when the Fathers say that in Baptism the Holy Ghost is given, meaning thereby that He is given in that part of the baptismal sacrament which we know by the name of Confirmation.

ALLHALLOWS BARKING,
S. Bartholomew's Day, 1891.

PREFACE TO THE SECOND EDITION

In a work of this kind, dealing with many writings of antiquity, it is not easy to be always in accurate accordance with the latest discoveries of criticism. Since the first edition was published, Haussleiter's work upon Primasius, Engelbrecht's upon Faustus of Riez, and that of Achelis upon the Coptic Constitutions, have necessitated some readjustment of my material. It is, I fear, only too probable that other readjustments might be desirable; but I have done the best I could to bring this edition up to the present state of knowledge with regard to the patristic literature.

The changes which I have had to make have no doctrinal value; nor have any of the criticisms upon my book which have appeared shown cause why any alteration in this direction should be made. No passage of Holy Scripture or of any ancient Father has yet been produced, so far as I have heard, to show that "the gift of the Holy Ghost" was thought to be received in Baptism pure and simple, or that Confirmation was considered to be a separate thing from

Baptism. Until such passages are produced, it will be safe, I believe, to rest upon the doctrine which these pages set forth. But it may be well, perhaps, in order to protect that doctrine from being misrepresented by carelessness or prejudice, to draw special attention to those parts of my work, such as pp. 35, 427, 428, 432–434, 455, where the Holy Spirit's action in Baptism proper is spoken of.

Those who care to see how Confirmation has fared in the Reformed Churches of the Continent, especially among the Lutherans, will find its fortunes interestingly traced by Professor Walter Caspari, in his *Evangelische Konfirmation* (Leipzig, 1891). Caspari, however, takes pains to show that the modern *Konfirmation* is not the same thing as the ancient sacrament which bears for us that name.

Amongst those whom I have most to thank for help in reference to various matters connected with this work, I must name first the ever-to-be-revered name of Dr. Hort, who gave me the benefit of criticisms only too few in number; and then, my friend the Rev. A. E. Burn, who first drew my attention to Engelbrecht's work on Faustus.

London,
January 16, 1893.

CONTENTS

PAGE

INTRODUCTION 1

SECTION I.—THE WITNESS OF HOLY SCRIPTURE.

Baptism, Unction, and Laying on of Hands in the Old Testament 7
Did the Apostles use Unction? 10
Our Lord's Baptism 14
The Paschal and Pentecostal Bestowals of the Spirit 16
I. Passages treating directly of both Baptism and Confirmation
(i.) Acts viii. 14–17 18
(ii.) Acts xix. 1–8 23
(iii.) Heb. vi. 1–6 28
II. Passages suggesting a twofold work in Baptism, but not mentioning a double rite
S. John iii. 5 not one of these 34
(i.) Acts ii. 38, 39 36
(ii.) Acts x. 47 37
(iii.) 1 Cor. x. 1 40
(iv.) 1 Cor. xii. 13 42
(v.) Gal. iv. 4 44
(vi.) Tit. iii. 4 46
References elsewhere to one or other of the baptismal acts without either being named 50

SECTION II.—PATRISTIC TESTIMONY.

CHAPTER I.—THE APOSTOLIC FATHERS.

The so-called "Second Epistle of Clement," and Hermas . . 54
Teaching of the Twelve Apostles 54
Barnabas 56

Chapter II.—The African Church.

PAGE

Tertullian 59
Cyprian 64
Contemporary African bishops 76
Lactantius 77
Optatus 78
Austin 81
on the component parts of Baptism 82
on the value of Unction 86
on the value of Laying on of Hands 93
on the relation of Unction to Laying on of Hands . . . 105
on their common relation to Baptism 106
on the gradation of gifts of the Spirit 107
Eugenius 108

Chapter III.—Rome and the West.

Irenaeus 110
Hippolytus 117
Cornelius 119
Novatian 120
The treatise *De Rebaptismate* 122
(Victorinus of Pettau) . . . . . 131 *note*
Council of Elvira 131
Council of Arles 132
Hilary of Poitiers 133
Pacian 139
The School of Northern Italy :—
Zeno of Verona 143
Ambrose of Milan 145
description of baptismal rites 146
their respective values 151
Gaudentius of Brescia 154
Rufinus of Aquileia 156
Peter of Ravenna 157
Maximus of Turin 158

PAGE

The Roman School:—
Hilary the Commentator 160
Jerome 163
minimises the difference between the baptismal and the subsequent gift 165
on the value of Unction 172
summary of his teaching 174
Roman bishops:—
Sirice 177
Innocent 178
(Prudentius) . . . . . 181 *note*
Leo 183
The Gallican divines:—
Prosper 188
Salvian 189
Faustus 190
The treatise *Praedestinatus* 196
Gennadius 197
The later Roman School:—
John the Deacon 199
Gregory the Great 202
The Scholars of the Transition period:—
Isidore of Seville 208
Hildefonsus 209
Bede 212
Alcuin 214
replies to his enquiries from
Odilbert 216
Amalarius of Treves 217
Leidrad 217
Magnus 218
Theodulf 219
teaching of his disciples
Amalarius of Metz 220
Raban 223
Pseudo-Primasius and Haymo 228

PAGE

APPENDIX I.

Ancient Western Baptismal Prayers 235

CHAPTER IV.—THE CHURCH OF ALEXANDRIA.

The *Egyptian Constitutions* 250

Clement of Alexandria

on the *Seal* 256

on "enlightenment" 258

on Unction 262

on Laying on of Hands 268

on the gift of the Spirit 271

Origen 273

Theognostus 279

Denys 280

Athanasius 281

Macarius 287

Didymus 290

Isidore of Pelusium 297

Cyril 299

APPENDIX II.

Baptismal Liturgy of the Coptic Church 307

CHAPTER V.—THE EASTERN CHURCHES IN GENERAL.

Justin Martyr 316

The *Apostolical Constitutions* 319

Theophilus of Antioch 330

Firmilian 331

The Palestinians:—

Eusebius 333

Cyril 336

Epiphanius 348

The Cappadocians:—

Basil 349

Gregory of Nyssa 357

Gregory of Nazianzus 359

(Council of Laodicea) . . . . . 363 *note*

PAGE

The Antiochenes :—
Chrysostom 363
Theodore of Mopsuestia 371
Theodoret 372
Miscellaneous Greek writers :—
Asterius of Amasea 375
Gennadius of Constantinople 376
The Syrian Church :—
Ephraem 377
Later Eastern writers :—
"Denys the Areopagite" 379
Anastasius of Sinai 383
John of Damascus 383
Photius of Constantinople 386
Oecumenius 387
Theophylact 388
APPENDIX III.
Greek Baptismal Offices 391
Armenian ,, ,, ... 396
Syrian ,, ,, ... 401
Jacobite ,, ,, ... 407

SECTION III.—THE GIFT OF THE HOLY GHOST.

Official Doctrine of the modern Roman Church as seen in Thomas Aquinas and the Tridentine Catechism ; the Gift a gift of additional strength, and consequently a sudden growth into maturity 414
Doctrine of the modern Oriental Church ; the Gift consists of the Indwelling Presence 422
Language of the Anglican formularies to be understood in the same sense 425
Meaning of S. John xiv. 17 ; "abiding with" and "being in" . . 432
What is meant by the word "in" as used of a personal being 435
Indwelling of evil spirits 438
Indwelling of the Holy Ghost 440
Differences between these indwellings 443

PAGE

Two senses in which the Holy Spirit is said to dwell in us, objective and subjective 448

It is the objective indwelling which is the Gift of Confirmation 450

But it ought to be followed by the subjective, known by some as the "Baptism of the Spirit" 453

Hard to trace the difference between the effects of Regeneration and those of the Indwelling because the first without the second is abnormal 454

Difference of condition in the Human Nature of our Lord before and after His Baptism 456

Our Confirmation, though not wholly like His, an ordination to priesthood 461

Difference of condition in the Apostles produced by the Paschal and the Pentecostal Gifts 464

Effects of Pentecost upon the Apostles not identical with normal effects of Confirmation, especially in regard to

(*a*) plenary inspiration 474

(*b*) miraculous *charismata* 476

Confirmation an endowment of the regenerate man to take his place in God's world 478

Its chief benefits gathered from the passages of Holy Scripture which describe the Holy Spirit as a Spirit "of" various gifts and graces 480

INTRODUCTION.

Baptism and Confirmation can only be regarded, by those who value the teaching of antiquity, as forming together one sacrament; and yet each part of that sacrament has its own special gift to convey. Confirmation is continually treated in early writings as one of the baptismal rites; and Baptism is spoken of as including in its spiritual effects that which it only includes inasmuch as it comprises also Confirmation.[1] And because the connexion between the two sacramental actions is so close, the peculiar and distinctive graces attached to them have often been confounded. This result has at different times been reached by different ways. When, in the sixteenth century, the Churches of the West came afresh into contact with those of the more remote East, it was supposed—and the discovery caused a shock of horror on both sides—that the West had, or professed to have, a sacrament unknown in the East. The cause was,—or was at least in part,—that whereas in the West Baptism and Confirmation had been increasingly differentiated, until it was difficult to discern their original oneness, in the far East they had been

[1] See the admirable dissertation of Touttée in his edition of S. Cyril of Jerusalem, p. clxxxix. foll.

increasingly fused, until it was difficult to discern their original separateness of character.

At times the tendency has been to reduce those acts which constitute Baptism and Confirmation, to a series of significant ceremonies performed in the course of a single operation of grace,—all necessary to the due completeness of Baptism, but none of them —or sometimes one and sometimes another—actually communicative of special gifts. As, in the case of the other great sacrament of the Gospel, the benefits of Holy Communion have come to be commonly attributed,—and that not only, though most markedly, in the Roman Church,—to the whole gracious transaction indiscriminately, and men have failed to perceive any special virtue in the participation of the Cup of the Lord, as distinguished from the sacred Bread, so, in the case of the first sacrament, it has often happened that devout believers have been content to find all the baptismal graces in Baptism as a whole, without analysing further. They have hardly cared to inquire which portion of the rite is the channel of which gift.

As might be expected, this tendency was especially to be observed among the ancient teachers of the Eastern portion of the Church, where Confirmation has always been administered concurrently with Baptism,—or if not always, yet much more regularly so than in the West. In the West, Confirmation has, as a rule, for nearly ten centuries been separated in practice from Baptism; it has been erected, with much insistence, into an independent sacrament; and

it has, therefore, necessarily attracted to itself the special attention of theologians. The effect, however, upon dogmatic statement has not been quite what might have been anticipated. While Eastern divines, since the great division took place, have generally adhered closely to the language of Scripture and primitive antiquity when obliged to discern in Confirmation something more than a feature in Baptism, Western divines, though with many exceptions, have been led in a different direction. The complete division between rites so essentially connected has resulted, among them, in effacing or blurring the outlines of both; and, in order to satisfy the expressions of Holy Scripture and of ancient authors with regard to Baptism,—the true key to which was lost,—it was felt necessary to restrict the value of Confirmation within narrow limits, and to give to the earlier half of the complex sacrament much that in better times was unhesitatingly ascribed to the second.

And in the Reformed Churches of the West, this tendency has had even more effect than in the unreformed. The reluctance to dignify by the name of a sacrament anything which cannot be directly proved to have been instituted by Christ Himself while He was on earth, led many of the earlier teachers in controversy with Rome still further to enrich Baptism at the expense of the Laying on of Hands. So great a gift as that which belongs to Confirmation could not consistently be traced to a rite which was less than a sacrament. It became

imperative, therefore, where sacraments were still regarded as more than symbols, to trace the gift to the application of that baptismal Water which Christ had undoubtedly prescribed, and to reduce Confirmation to a blessing pronounced upon those who were publicly taking up their baptismal inheritance. This once done, and the tradition accepted, it seemed something like a treason to wish to restore the language of older days; and the revival of an energetic faith in the Divine means of grace, which has so marked our own generation in England, has, in many quarters, made men cleave with increased tenacity to forms of expression regarding Baptism which not only leave scanty room for what properly belongs to the Laying on of Hands, but which also react upon Baptism itself by exaggerating difficulties already felt by many to be connected with it.

In the following dissertation I shall endeavour to set forth articulately the primitive teaching upon this fundamental subject. I hope that I need not disavow any inclination to make light of the most precious sacrament of our Regeneration; but at the same time, if I succeed in my object, it will appear that language which is frequently used amongst us in reference to Baptism in the modern sense of that word, is, if we defer to ancient usage, only applicable to Baptism, when Baptism is again regarded as including Confirmation also. It will appear that if we are still to treat the two grace-giving rites as if they were not parts of a single whole, we ought at least not to teach men to expect, in receiving the first

to become partakers of that which God has attached to the second.

For the objects of this investigation it will not be necessary to enter upon certain often-debated questions, important in themselves, but belonging rather to Canon Law than to Theology proper with regard to the matter, and to the minister, of Confirmation. It is not my purpose to inquire what constitutes a valid Confirmation,—whether the proper matter of it be Unction, or Laying on of Hands, or both combined, or either alternatively,—nor what is the necessary "form" or accompanying words,—nor whether the administration of it is to be restricted to any special order in the Church. For my purpose it will be sufficient to accept as Confirmation whatever seems at any time to have been so accepted.[1] My object is only to ascertain what it is that we receive by Confirmation in addition to the purely Baptismal grace, when all the right conditions are fulfilled.

The course of the investigation will be as follows. In the first instance I shall review briefly those passages of the Bible which bear directly upon the subject, endeavouring to extract from them their literal and grammatical meaning, but reserving their spiritual importance for further examination at the close. Then, I shall pass to the doctrine of Confirmation as it appears in the history of the early Church, embodied in liturgical formulas, and occasionally in the decrees of Councils, as well as in

[1] So Hooker, for instance, does (*Eccl. Pol.* book V. § 66).

the writings of individual teachers. We shall then be in a position to consider the more mysterious and the more profitable question, what, after all, is meant by the sacred phrases whose history we have endeavoured to trace.

SECTION I.

THE WITNESS OF HOLY SCRIPTURE.

Most of the rites and institutions of the Christian religion are adapted from rites and institutions previously existing in the Church of the Jews. Among such is the sacrament of Baptism. S. John the Forerunner, though he derived his title from the rite of baptism, was not the first to invent it. Baptism had long been regularly used for the admission of proselytes from other nations to the religious community of Israel;[1] and, in a more occasional manner, it was used in the case of cleansing from various Levitical defilements, and as a preliminary to the consecration of priests to their office,[2] and before the offering of certain sacrifices (as on the great day of Atonement[3]), and on other solemn occasions.

Of these various baptisms (which, of course, all have one signification, namely that of cleansing from pollutions, in preparation for something sacred to come), the one most like to Christian Baptism is the baptism of proselytes. It would be a matter of great interest if it could be discovered that this baptism of

[1] See Edersheim *Life and Times of Jesus the Messiah* App. xii.
[2] Exod. xxix. 4. [3] Lev. xvi. 4.

proselytes included any ceremonies at all corresponding to the New Testament Confirmation. Dr. Edersheim[1] says that it "would of course be accompanied by exhortations and benedictions." So far, however, as I have been able to ascertain, it was not accompanied either by any anointing or by any benedictory application of the hand. Nor did either of these actions, so far as we know, find a place in the baptism of John, although Theodoret and others[2] assume that John used a laying on of hands. It was, then, a new idea, to attach the rites of unction and of laying on of hands to the Baptism which was to admit men as proselytes into the Christian Church. In order to see what this new grouping would imply, it is necessary to see how these rites were employed before the coming of Christ.

Unction was employed as a sign of the consecration both of things and of persons. Thus Jacob poured oil upon the stone which he erected at Bethel (Gen. xxviii. 18), and Moses was bidden to anoint the tabernacle and every article of its furniture (Exod. xl. 9). Persons were anointed to three kinds of office. Every one is familiar with the threefold division of the office of the Christ, the Anointed, which is based upon this fact. It seems that prophets were anointed, at least in some instances, for Elijah is bidden to anoint Elisha to be prophet in his room (1 Kings xix. 16), though the language may perhaps be figurative, as we do not read of his actually performing such a rite. Kings were undoubtedly anointed, and so were

[1] *L. c.* p. 746. [2] See below, p. 372.

priests; and the meaning of the symbol, half-sacramental as it was, is clearly seen when we read in connexion with the anointing of David that "Samuel took the horn of oil, and anointed him in the midst of his brethren; and the Spirit of the Lord came mightily upon David from that day onward" (1 Sam. xvi. 13). It is important to observe that in the case of the consecration of priests, this unction followed close upon a baptism (Exod. xxix. 4, 7). No one would doubt that in this case the unction is the greater rite of the two, and constitutes the very "ordination" of the priest, to which the baptism acts as a necessary antecedent. The same order is significantly observed in the case of the cleansing of a leper. The leper first washes, twice over, at an interval of seven days, and on the day after the second baptism he receives a special form of anointing (Lev. xiv. 8, 9, 17, 18). It betokens his readmission to membership in a consecrated and priestly people, for which his washing prepares him, but which his washing does not itself confer.[1]

Laying on of hands is no part of the ordinary and prescribed ritual of the Old Testament;[2] but it is

[1] It is thought by some of the Fathers that the unction of Solomon to be king was preceded by a baptism, because David commands that he should be "brought down to Gihon" to be anointed (1 Kings i. 33, 34). Possibly they confounded this Gihon with the river of Paradise (Gen. ii. 13); but the place was a place of waters (see Smith's *Dict. of the Bible*, s. *v.*), and no other reason is known for selecting that spot for Solomon's inauguration.

[2] It is indeed prescribed for a purpose very distant from that for which the Church has learned to use it; for instance Lev. xxv. 14, and compare Lev. xvi. 21. The point in which all layings on of the hand

frequently used in solemn benedictions, as in that of the sons of Joseph by Jacob (Gen. xlviii. 14). Its full meaning in the New Dispensation is foreshadowed where we read, as if it were the thing to be naturally expected, that "Joshua the son of Nun was full of the spirit of wisdom; for Moses had laid his hands upon him" (Deut. xxxiv. 9). At a later time, but before the days of our Lord's earthly life, the appointment of a Rabbi took place by "laying on," or *Semikhah*, as it was called;[1] and it is said that only those were allowed thus to lay on hands who could trace their own ordination, if I may call it so, up to Moses through Joshua. The Rev. Michael Rosenthal tells me that the rite is used when a Jewish child is admitted to be, according to the well-known custom, a "son of precept." "There is not," he says, "any known *ancient* formula for the benediction or rather invocation. But invariably the Rabbi puts both hands on the head of the boy and prays that God might bless and defend that son of Israel and make him a blessing to his people." Mr. Rosenthal adds that this ceremony was never called by the name of "laying on" (or *Semikhah*). It is, however, very doubtful how ancient this custom may be.

It must always remain a question whether the rite of Unction in Baptism was used by the Apostles themselves. The language of S. Paul and of S. John

resemble each other is that they all solemnly designate the object upon which the Divine blessing or wrath is invoked, and determine it upon that object.

[1] Edersheim *Life and Times of Jesus the Messiah* vol. ii. p. 382.

(2 Cor. i. 21 ; 1 John ii. 20 foll.), as is now universally acknowledged, refers to the inward unction of the Holy Ghost, and not to an outward symbol of it ; but at the same time the language would have additional force if it reminded the reader of a visible act which had been performed upon him. Such expressions abound in the Fathers who habitually used the rite : they delight to refer mystically to the thing signified in terms derived from that which signifies it. It will be seen hereafter[1] that it was almost certainly employed by those who enjoyed the confidence of S. John in his old age. And it seems to me difficult to suppose that the rite could have become so universal at so early a date as it undoubtedly did, if it had not had the highest of sanctions. The idea which such an unction suggested, to those whose minds were steeped in the symbolism of the Old Testament, is an idea which the Apostles emphasize. It would not be an emblem of the consecrating influence of the Holy Spirit in general ; it would be the sign of consecration to a priesthood. This is a thought expressed by S. Peter and by S. John. "Ye are a chosen generation, a royal hierarchy, a sacred people" (1 Pet. ii. 9). "He made us to be a kingdom, priests to His God and Father" (Rev. i. 6). The same thought underlies the imagery of the Epistle to the Hebrews, where every Christian now, under the "Great Priest," has right of way into the Holy of Holies, "having his body washed with pure water." Christian Baptism, given once for all, is made parallel with the baptism of the Jewish

[1] See p. 256.

high priest, renewed every year on the day of his most solemn service. If this idea of the priesthood of the Christian was so prominent in the thoughts of the Apostles, there would be nothing strange in their using a ceremony which perfectly expressed it; nor, indeed, in its forming part of those instructions concerning the kingdom of God which Christ gave them, by the Holy Ghost, between His resurrection and His ascension (Acts i. 2, 3).

If our Lord did not prescribe, nor the Apostles practise, the rite of unction in Baptism, it is certain that a rite was practised and insisted upon, and blessed by the Holy Ghost, if not ordered by Christ, which was closely connected with anointing. Our Lord, who Himself used the natural and affecting gesture of laying on His hand in blessing, and in healing,—who took the little children in His arms, put His hands upon them, and blessed them, and to whom men came with the request, "Lay Thine hand upon her, and she shall live,"—promised His disciples that when they should imitate His example with sick folk, the healing effect should follow: "They shall lay their hands upon the sick, and they shall be well" ([S. Mark] xvi. 18). The disciples had already, no doubt by His direction, obtained the same beneficent end by means of a rite of unction: "They cast out many devils, and anointed with oil many that were sick, and healed them" (S. Mark vi. 13). And S. James seems to teach that the conditions of our Lord's promise to the faithful use of laying on of hands were satisfied by continuing to use this unction: "Let them pray over

him, anointing him with oil in the name of the Lord, and the prayer of faith shall save the sick, and the Lord shall raise him up" (S. James v. 14, 15). The unction of the sick, and laying of hands upon them, are not identical with those which belong to Baptism; but they bear a close resemblance to them, and they show how near akin the two rites are between themselves. Both are forms of solemnly setting a person apart, and commending him to God, calling down and applying to the person so blessed the graces and powers of the Holy Ghost. If we may attempt to trace a distinction between the two symbols so intimately associated together, perhaps Unction represents more definitely the thought of consecration, and Laying on of Hands that of benediction. Thus in Baptism, the Unction attaches itself more directly to the Laver, as an official dedication to the Christian priesthood, for which the man has been made ready by the washing away of his sins; while the Laying on of Hands, which speaks rather of a transmission of sacred powers from man to man and from generation to generation, calls the new-made Christian to wider duties in the world, and invokes upon him the Spirit by which he may be enabled to accomplish his task.[1]

Before examining the passages of the New Testament which treat directly of Confirmation in its

[1] Laying on of Hands seems distinctly to imply a personal contact; but at no very late period in the Christian Church it began to be thought that the term was satisfied by a lifting up of the hands over the persons to be blessed.

relation to Baptism, a very few words must be premised upon two deep subjects closely connected with the whole inquiry. The first is the Baptism of our Blessed Lord; the second is the Lord's twofold giving of the Holy Ghost.

(*a*) A man may well shrink from even touching upon so mysterious a theme as the Baptism of Christ. It will not, however, be necessary for us here to attempt to deal with every aspect of it. We are not bound to consider, for our immediate purpose, some questions relating to the person of Christ which His Baptism suggested to the ancient theologians,—how He who is the giver of the Holy Ghost, could come to be the recipient; how He, through whom all others obtain the Divine Unction, could be anointed, or anoint Himself, as Christ; and the like.

It is perhaps not intended that we should be able to trace out a resemblance in every particular between the Baptism which our Lord underwent and that to which He invites us. His Baptism was in more than one respect different from ours. Outwardly it had the form of the baptism of John, though the spiritual movements which attended it were more like to those of the Christian sacrament. We need not therefore be solicitous because there was, so far as we are aware, no symbolical unction in it but only the spiritual analogue, and no imposition of hands—unless we say with Optatus that the voice from heaven took its place.[1] Christ's Baptism, though in a sense it was the inauguration of ours, does not in every detail form a

[1] See below, p. 79.

model to be rigidly copied in ours. The point in which chiefly we may see guidance for the matter now in hand is this: Our Lord's own Baptism consisted of more than a single act, while remaining essentially one throughout. It culminated in the descent of the Holy Ghost to abide upon Him; but this descent was not the concomitant of the actual immersion. The immersion was a preparation for it, no doubt, but only a preparation. "On being baptized," we read (*βαπτισθείς*), "Jesus went straightway up from the water; and behold, the heavens were opened, and He saw the Spirit of God, descending like a dove, coming upon Him; and behold, a voice from the heavens saying, This is My beloved Son, in whom I am well pleased."[1] S. Mark makes the moment of the descent still clearer; "And immediately, as He was coming up (*ἀναβαίνων*) out of the water, He saw the heavens rending, and the Spirit, like a dove, descending upon Him."[2] S. Luke adds a further detail: "Jesus having been baptized and being engaged in prayer (*βαπτισθέντος καὶ προσευχομένου*), the heaven was opened, and the Holy Ghost descended in a bodily appearance like a dove upon Him."[3]

This is not the moment at which to ponder the effects which were produced upon the human nature of our Saviour by His Baptism and by the descent of the Spirit upon Him. To this mystery it may be proper to recur hereafter. All that need be said now is that there are two mistakes to be avoided. One mistake (of which probably no one within the borders

[1] S. Matt. iii. 16. [2] S. Mark i. 10. [3] S. Luke iii. 21.

of the Church was ever guilty) would be to suppose that this was the first visitation of the Holy Spirit to the Incarnate Lord; the other mistake is to suppose that what now happened was only outward and visible, a sign by which John might identify the Lamb of God, or to indicate the blessings in store for those who should be baptized with Christian Baptism, but adding no new enrichment to the developing life or work of Christ. This latter opinion might, indeed, without difficulty, find support in utterances of ancient teachers of great authority; but none the less it cannot but be mistaken. Assuming, therefore, that the descent of the Spirit to abide upon Christ represents a true epoch in the inner life of the Incarnate Lord, and that it has some resemblance to the gift of the Holy Ghost bestowed in the Church, we observe that though given in the course of what we call His Baptism, it is not given by means of the Baptism itself. Whether any new direct action of the Holy Spirit upon His sacred soul was set up by the Baptism itself, we are not told;—John's baptism was for others only a baptism of repentance and not a sacrament of grace, not even conveying (though some in old days believed that it conveyed) forgiveness of sins, and by John's own confession destitute of the future gift of the Holy Ghost. But whatever the act of Baptism itself was or was not to our Lord, it was by a distinct, though connected, movement, that He received the abiding unction of the Holy Ghost.

(*b*) Two opposite mistakes are, as has been said, possible with regard to the coming of the Holy Ghost

upon Christ at His Baptism. Two opposite mistakes, likewise, not only are possible, but have actually been made, in relation to the twofold bestowal of the Spirit after the Lord's Death and Resurrection. It has been supposed on the one hand that when He breathed upon His disciples on the night after His Resurrection He bestowed upon them, then and there, all that He had promised when He foretold the coming of the new Comforter; and that the Day of Pentecost brought no new gift, but was only the open manifestation of what had already been received. It has been supposed on the other hand that the breathing, and the words which accompanied it, conveyed nothing to the disciples at the time, and were only a further promise of what was to come fifty days later. Both these opinions seem to be far from the truth. Our Lord would not have performed a symbolic action, saying, "Receive ye," if the symbol did not represent an actual and concurrent bestowal of the thing He spoke of. Nor, again, would He have said, "Wait for the promise of the Father," "Ye shall be baptized with the Holy Ghost not many days hence," if the gift given immediately after the Resurrection had comprised all that they were waiting for. The meaning of the two givings of the Spirit, and their relation to each other, will come before us again from time to time. Here we need only observe that neither giving is so to be treated as to evacuate the other. It is natural to suppose that the Paschal gift stands related to the Pentecostal as Baptism is related to Confirmation (see Dr. Westcott on S. John xx. 22 ;

but whether this be an exact statement of the case or not, the successive bestowals, at definite moments, of gifts akin to each other but not identical, prepares us for those words of Holy Scripture which teach us directly concerning the double sacrament of our initiation into Christ. It shews us that what in one aspect, may be called a giving or receiving of the Holy Ghost, may in another aspect be denied to be such, because the name belongs so much more fully to a subsequent act of the divine bounty as to make it unnatural to describe the earlier one in those terms.

I now proceed to the passages of Holy Scripture which show directly the connexion between Confirmation and Baptism. These may be divided into two groups. In the one group both rites are expressly mentioned; in the other, both are implied.

I. Three well-known passages are comprised in the former group.

(i.) Of these the first in order of time,—and of precision also,—is that which records the work of S. Philip the Evangelist at Samaria. We read there that "the Apostles at Jerusalem, hearing that Samaria had received the word of God, sent to them Peter and John; who,[1] on coming down, prayed concerning them, that[2] they might receive the Holy Spirit. For upon none of them was He as yet fallen; but they had been baptized into the name of the Lord Jesus,

[1] The word *οἵτινες* implies that it was the purpose of their mission.

[2] The word *ὅπως* implies that the gift of the Holy Ghost was not only the thing which they prayed for, but that their prayer was instrumental in obtaining the gift. Thus it has usually been held that such a prayer is essential to a valid Confirmation.

and no more. Then they laid their hands upon them, and they received the Holy Spirit."[1]

Nothing could be clearer than the distinction which the sacred historian here observes between Christening and the Laying on of Hands. The men of whom he speaks had already been "baptized into the name of the Lord Jesus." They had passed, therefore, into the number of those who belonged to Him. They were members of His Church. They were no longer as before their Baptism, believers indeed, but believers waiting outside the gate. They had been definitely admitted into a participation of the privileges and benefits of Christianity. S. Luke does not, however, specify the advantages which, by this means, they already enjoyed;—he assumes that these are known;—he rather draws attention to that which they still lacked. The great prerogative of the Gospel dispensation is the gift of that which he calls "Holy Spirit." This had not yet been vouchsafed to them. It formed no part of that Baptism through which they had passed. Out of all the numbers who had been christened, there was not one upon whom this gift had descended. The gift is not spoken of as a thing of degrees, a measure of which had already

[1] Acts viii. 14–17: *ἀκούσαντες δὲ οἱ ἐν Ἰεροσολύμοις ἀπόστολοι ὅτι δέδεκται ἡ Σαμαρία τὸν λόγον τοῦ θεοῦ ἀπέστειλαν πρὸς αὐτοὺς Πέτρον καὶ Ἰωάνην, οἵτινες καταβάντες προσηύξαντο περὶ αὐτῶν ὅπως λάβωσιν πνεῦμα ἅγιον. οὐδέπω γὰρ ἦν ἐπ' οὐδενὶ αὐτῶν ἐπιπεπτωκός, μόνον δὲ βεβαπτισμένοι ὑπῆρχον εἰς τὸ ὄνομα τοῦ κυρίου Ἰησοῦ. τότε ἐπετίθεσαν τὰς χεῖρας ἐπ' αὐτούς, καὶ ἐλάμβανον πνεῦμα ἅγιον.* It will be observed that the expression here (as in Acts xix. 2) is *πνεῦμα ἅγιον*, not *τὸ ἅγιον πνεῦμα*. The imperfect *ἐλάμβανον* seems to mean that *one after another* was seen to receive the gift.

been given, though not the whole. The distinction is sharp and absolute. Whatever is meant in the Acts of the Apostles by "receiving Holy Spirit," these men and women of Samaria, whom Philip had baptized into the name of the Lord Jesus, had had no such experience.

And yet the language employed appears to indicate that there was something unsatisfactory in such a position. "They had *only* been baptized." It was an unusual situation for Christian men to be found in,—baptized, and yet not possessed of the specific gift of "Holy Spirit." Christian initiation—so it is implied—ought normally to have included this gift. It was as if they had been stopped in the middle of their Baptism,—one part of it validly conferred and not needing to be repeated, but another kept in reserve. Their Baptism was not as yet consummated by that great blessing to which it was an introduction. Though very far from being a barren and ineffectual ceremony, their Baptism by itself was nevertheless, in the eyes of the inspired writer, an inchoate thing, demanding the gift of "Holy Spirit" as its natural and destined completion. This natural and destined completion it only received through the prayers and the imposed hands of the Apostles who came down from Jerusalem for the purpose.

The reason why the Samaritan converts did not receive the Holy Spirit at the outset is not to be found in any irregularity or deficiency, either in the men themselves,[1] or in the form of their Baptism, or

[1] This is the view taken even by Neander *Planting of Christianity* p. 60 foll. (ed. Bohn).

in the person who administered it. For the men themselves, no conversion could be more satisfactory than that which is traced in the sacred narrative. Entranced attention to the words of the Evangelist, much joy as apprehension became increasingly clear, the dissipation of formerly strong delusions, confident acceptance of Philip's message concerning "the kingdom of God and the name of Jesus Christ," all led the way to the birth of water and Spirit through which they entered into that kingdom, and inherited the salvation contained in that name. Nor is the fact that they are said to have been "baptized into the name of the Lord Jesus" any ground for supposing that an insufficient formula of Baptism was employed. If it were so, then many other Baptisms recorded in the Acts of the Apostles were insufficient likewise. We need not now pause to inquire what were the words used. Whatever they were, the historian evidently intends us to understand that the Baptism was as true Christian Baptism as any other.[1] Nor

[1] Acts ii. 38 (ἐπὶ τῷ ὀνόματι); x. 48 (ἐν τῷ ὀνόματι); xix. 5 (εἰς τὸ ὄνομα). Comp. 1 Cor. i. 13, 15. Although it is natural that the words which our Lord used in the institution of Holy Baptism should be used in the administration of it, yet they are not used merely as a prescribed formula, nor merely as a declaration of the authority on which the minister acts. They express the *intention* of the Church in baptizing,—which is, to introduce the neophyte *into* all the benefits of the full revelation of God. It may well be argued—and has been maintained by catholic-minded men—that Baptism administered with the formula, "in the name of Jesus Christ," or "of the Lord Jesus," would be a valid Baptism—at any rate when used with the Church's intention,—inasmuch as the whole Christian revelation is contained implicitly in that name. Those who care to inquire further into the question will find a useful note in the Benedictine edition of S.

does it appear that the Deacon-Evangelist was overstepping the bounds of his authority when he undertook to christen, and that on that account the rite which he administered fell short of its proper effects.[1] Although the deacon is generally considered only to baptize on sufferance, and not by inherent right, yet his baptisms are never considered to be on that account less efficacious than those administered by higher officers of the Church. If that were the case, then it would be a defrauding of souls to suffer the deacon to baptize at all. But the fact that (as we shall see) the Laying on of Hands followed upon baptisms performed by command, and in presence, of an Apostle shews that the action of the Twelve was not caused by anything unconstitutional in S. Philip's conduct. By the same argument it may be proved that it was not on account of the exceptional issues of this particular occurrence that the Holy Spirit was not given. Never before, indeed, so far as we know, had any persons of other than Jewish origin and religion been added to the Church; and this, no doubt, is the reason why S. Luke *relates* the event. It was, therefore, very suitable that the highest personages in the Church should concur in the reception of the Samaritans. But if S. Philip had misgivings about their reception, and therefore refrained from invoking upon them a

Ambrose (who was supposed to favour the validity of such baptisms) on *De Spiritu Sancto* i. § 42. But as a matter of fact the text of Acts viii. 16 tells us nothing about the formula employed.

[1] This appears to have lain confusedly beneath the arguments of those (Roman) controversialists to whom S. Cyprian replies *Epist.* lxxiii. 9.

gift which he would have invoked upon others,[1] the hesitation would have kept him from christening them at all. Still less is it likely that the Holy Ghost Himself on this occasion withheld a gift which He was generally wont to bestow in Baptism,[2] thereby virtually refusing to set His seal to what S. Philip had done, until the Apostles should ratify it. No word is said which justifies the often repeated assertion that this was the first time that the Laying on of Hands was used. It seems, therefore, a plain conclusion that the usual account of the matter given by the Church is true,—that S. Philip was invested with the power to baptize, but not with the power to confirm; and that the gift of "Holy Spirit" is no part of Baptism (in the restricted sense of the word), but is the distinctive gift of Confirmation.[3]

(ii.) The second passage to which we must refer corroborates this conclusion. The unique section,

[1] S. Chrysostom suggests this view (*in Act. Apost. Hom.* xviii. p. 143 Migne: Φιλίππου τούτῳ τιμῶντος τάχα τοὺς ἀποστόλους), but considers it less probable than the view that S. Philip was not empowered to confer the gift. It has also been held in modern times.

[2] This is the view advocated by Meyer *ad loc.* The question is discussed at length by Baumgarten (*Apost. Hist.* vol. i. pp. 190–198), who endeavours to reconcile Neander's view with Meyer's.

[3] It is frequently urged that the word ἐπιπίπτειν used in this passage is only applicable to the gift of the miraculous *charismata*, and not of sanctifying grace. It is true that something of violence and suddenness seems to be implied; but in any case it is the Holy Ghost Himself who falls upon men, and not His gifts, whether moral or miraculous; and the fact that He comes in an extraordinary mode does not preclude His bringing with Him His ordinary influences. Oswald *Dogmat. Lehre v. d. hl. Sakram.* vol. i. p. 256 has some excellent remarks upon this subject; among others, that if He is called expressly the "Holy" Spirit in this context, it is impossible to exclude the thought of His sanctifying action.

Acts xviii. 24–xix. 8, reveals to us a phenomenon of great interest. A body of earnest disciples of S. John the Baptist appears unexpectedly, side by side with the Apostolic Church, and mixing with it without the difference being at once and to all apparent. S. Paul, however, upon arriving at Ephesus, where these "disciples" were, observed, as it seems, that they were not like other Christians. His question may, indeed, have been one which he was accustomed to put to disciples whom he had not seen before. But more probably it was occasioned by perceiving that the men were lacking in those spiritual gifts which abounded in the Church. He asked them whether they had "received the Holy Spirit on becoming believers."[1]

Evidently this was the case with most Christians; but these men replied, with some surprise, that they had not even been informed on that occasion of the existence of any "Holy Spirit." By this, of course, must be understood that they had not heard of the fulfilment of their founder's prophecy; they did not know that the promised gift was already to be had.[2] The Apostle perceived at once that their baptism—for either he assumed that they had been baptized in some form, or perhaps had been told of it before—was not the usual Christian Baptism, and he inquired what it had been. He was informed that it was the baptism of John. Thereupon S. Paul explained the

[1] Acts xix. 2: εἰ πνεῦμα ἅγιον ἐλάβετε πιστεύσαντες.

[2] Acts xix. 2: ἀλλ' οὐδ' εἰ πνεῦμα ἅγιον ἔστιν ἠκούσαμεν. Comp. S. John vii. 39: "For as yet there was no Spirit (οὔπω γὰρ ἦν πνεῦμα), because that Jesus was not yet glorified."

relation of that rite to Christian Baptism,—that it served as a penitential preparation for it, but was in no wise an equivalent. Upon receiving this instruction, the men were at once christened. Baptism having now been conferred, the men really were in the position in which S. Paul had supposed them to be when he asked them his first question:—they were Christians, but not yet in possession of the gift of the Spirit. Then, when by their Baptism they were qualified to receive the gift, S. Paul laid hands upon them, and "the Holy Ghost came upon them."[1]

This incident shows us, amongst other things, how completely the Apostles were at one on the subject of Baptism and the Laying on of Hands. In the story of the conversion of Samaria, the two most prominent leaders of the original college, acting not in their own name alone, but in that of the Twelve as a body, do precisely that which S. Paul does at Ephesus. The rite which they used, he uses,—and with the same effect. But the incident shews us more than this. If S. Luke had not recorded the Christening of these disciples of S. John, we might perhaps have supposed that it was only in extraordinary cases that the Laying on of Hands was resorted to, in order to supplement a Baptism which had been in some way abnormal or defective. We might have thought (as many have done) that John's baptism sufficiently

[1] Acts xix. 6: *καὶ ἐπιθέντος αὐτοῖς τοῦ Παύλου χεῖρας ἦλθεν τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον ἐπ' αὐτούς.* Here the full title of the Holy Ghost is to be observed. The turn of the expression (*ἐπιθέντος τοῦ Παύλου χεῖρας*, not *τὰς χεῖρας*, or the like) is an indication how customary, and in the ordinary course of things, the Apostle's action was felt to be.

fulfilled the requirements of our Lord regarding an outward and ceremonial application of water, and only needed the Imposition of the Apostle's hands to add that inward and spiritual grace, which brought it up to the level of the Christian sacrament. But the historian expressly records that this was not S. Paul's method of procedure. It did not satisfy him to carry the men straight from John's baptism to the Laying on of Hands. He made them pass from the one to the other through the Christian sacrament, and then, and not till then, confirmed them. If the narrative of the conversion of Samaria had left any doubt, the narrative of the disciples at Ephesus makes it clear, that the gift of the Holy Ghost is not attached, even in the most favourable circumstances, to the sacrament of Baptism by itself, but to the Laying on of Hands. It is inconceivable that the Baptism which these men underwent by S. Paul's own directions should have been in any way less efficacious than those which are commonly administered in the Church; and yet we do not read, "And when they were baptized into the name of the Lord Jesus, the Holy Ghost came on them," but, "And when Paul laid hands upon them."

This fact is all the more remarkable from the way in which S. Paul's question evidently connects the gift with Baptism. When he asked, "Into what then were ye baptized?" he shewed that he considered the gift as being properly a part—nay, the chief part—of Christian Baptism. Had it been otherwise, his question would have taken some other turn. He might have asked, who these strange instructors were

who had made believers of them and yet had omitted the doctrine of the Holy Spirit; or how they came to be received by the Christians of Ephesus as fellow-disciples, when they were ignorant on so fundamental a topic. But the defect in their instruction made S. Paul inquire about their baptism. What could that baptism have been which not only had been unaccompanied by the gift of the Holy Ghost, but had even left them unaware of what they were entitled to receive?[1]

The same close connexion of the two things is again apparent in the words which describe their Baptism. "They were baptized into the name of the Lord Jesus; and when Paul laid hands on them, the Holy Ghost came upon them." S. Luke is evidently describing no unusual ceremony. He does not even, as in his account of what happened at Samaria, make a principal verb of the Apostle's action and say, "Then Paul laid his hands upon them." He proceeds as if the Imposition of Hands was a natural part of the administration of the sacrament, and notes that the Baptism thus fully completed had the desired effect. The thing which he wishes to be observed is, not that on this occasion a gift usually given in Baptism was for some reason given by the Laying on

[1] Baumgarten (vol. ii. p. 275) endeavours to make out that this was a crucial occasion when it was necessary to prove the true Apostleship of S. Paul to the Gentiles, even as in the case of Samaria the authority of the Twelve had been secured. In order to support this idea, so unlikely in itself, it is necessary to assume, first, that the men were Gentiles, and, secondly, that the Imposition of Hands was a rare occurrence, of signal importance.

of the Apostle's Hands instead, but rather that by a very marked example was shewn the superiority of Christian Baptism over John's. The whole book of the Acts has been called the "Gospel of the Holy Ghost." It begins with Christ's own words contrasting His Baptism with His precursor's (ch. i. 5). It relates how these words rang in S. Peter's mind when he ordered Cornelius to be christened (ch. xi. 16). Here it registers a most instructive experience of the comparative effects of the two rites. Christian Baptism, even in its first act, is a thing of immeasurably greater value than John's; but when completed in the normal manner by the Laying on of Hands, it then fulfils all that John had predicted of it.

(iii.) Clear and marked, however, as are the lessons of these two incidents, we might perhaps have still regarded them as exceptional cases,—that is to say, if there had been no tradition of Church life, but only the letter of Scripture, to go by—were it not for the third *locus classicus* in the New Testament. The words of the Epistle to the Hebrews, in ch. v. 11—vi. 6, preclude such a view. The inspired author there complains that the men to whom he writes, who had so long been Christians that they ought now to be teachers of others, had forgotten the very "earliest alphabet of Scripture" (*τὰ στοιχεῖα τῆς ἀρχῆς τῶν λογίων τοῦ θεοῦ*),—those elementary truths, that is, without the knowledge of which the Old Testament, which he wished to expound, must remain unintelligible to them. Those truths he describes directly after as "the word of the beginning of Christ" (*τὸν τῆς ἀρχῆ*;

τοῦ Χριστοῦ λόγον),—that is, the instructions that would be given at the very outset of the Christian career,—and then, as the "foundation" which is assumed to have been laid, without which, of course, no edifice could be built up or stand.[1] It is not, however, he says, his purpose to go through these rudiments of the faith with them; not because he felt such teaching to be beneath him, but because the nearest Christian could give it them, and because, much as they needed to be reminded of it, they were not really ignorant of it. He has teaching of a more mature and advanced kind to communicate to them. He calls upon them, therefore, to summon up their energies and to pass with him from these infant lessons to considerations more befitting their long standing in the Church. After a rapid enumeration of certain cardinal things which he does not intend to enlarge upon, he proceeds to give an exposition of profound mysteries of Scripture.

What then does he name as the initial and fundamental points, familiar to every Christian, or, at least, as examples of such points? Six things are mentioned;

[1] The Revised Version, with its somewhat pedantic "*a* foundation," is more misleading than the Authorised "*the* foundation." The absence of the definite article in Greek, μὴ πάλιν θεμέλιον καταβαλλόμενοι, assuredly does not obtrude upon us, as the English "*a* foundation" does, that other foundations might possibly be preferred. That the foundation of which the writer goes on to speak had, as a matter of fact, been laid, is definitely involved in the word "again;" therefore "*the* foundation" more truly represents the thought. Nor is there anything whatever to show that the foundation in the case of these Hebrews differed from that which was usually laid; on the contrary, the whole argument of the context depends upon the universality of such a ground-work.

or to speak more exactly, three pairs of things, or we might even say, three things, each of which consists of two parts. First comes repentance and faith, set somewhat by itself; next, the "doctrine of Baptisms and of Laying on of Hands;" thirdly, the doctrine "of resurrection of the dead and of eternal judgment."[1] It needs no words to shew the significance of such a collocation of thoughts. A passage of S. Paul[2] which partly resembles this, has often been taken to indicate that the Apostle was somewhat contemptuous of Baptism, and had greater things to think of. False as such a notion is there, it is impossible here. The writer classes the "doctrine of Baptisms and of Laying on of Hands" with things which no evangelically minded man could treat with impatience or disrespect, even when put in comparison with other things. Repentance and faith, the doctrine of resurrection and judgment, are acknowledged on all sides to be of the most vital importance to the soul. Unless, therefore, we are prepared to reject the authority of the Epistle to the Hebrews,[3] we are

[1] Heb. vi. 1, 2: *μὴ πάλιν θεμέλιον καταβαλλόμενοι μετανοίας ἀπὸ νεκρῶν ἔργων καὶ πίστεως ἐπὶ θεόν, βαπτισμῶν διδαχὴν* (διδαχῆς) *ἐπιθέσεώς τε χειρῶν, ἀναστάσεως* (—*σεώς τε*) *νεκρῶν καὶ κρίματος αἰωνίου.* It makes no difference for our present purpose whether we read *διδαχὴν* or *διδαχῆς*. In the former case, it is co-ordinated with *θεμέλιον*: in the second, it depends upon it, and is co-ordinated with *μετανοίας* and *πίστεως*. The former not only has (in the judgment of Hort and Westcott) somewhat the best authority, but it preserves more clearly the logical distinction between that which a man does and that which he is taught.

[2] 1 Cor. i. 14–16.

[3] This is now sometimes the case with Christians outside the Church who feel the pressure of the argument in the text. But even if the

compelled to assign a like importance to the doctrine of Baptisms and of Laying on of Hands. This could never be the case with a thing which was of human institution, or of transitory usefulness. Such language as that of this Epistle is quite incompatible, for instance, with the common notion that the gift bestowed by the Imposition of Hands was primarily a gift of miraculous powers. Not only did such powers early cease to be exhibited, as a rule, but, while they lasted, they were valued by S. Paul at a much lower value than some homely moral qualities.[1] Evidently, if the doctrine of the Laying on of Hands had been primarily concerned with miraculous displays, no man of S. Paul's way of thinking could have made that doctrine a part of the fundamentals of Christian religion, along with the doctrine of eternal judgment. It is clear that the rite must be of the first order of importance, if a man must not only have received it, but must also know thoroughly what it means, on pain of being scarcely considered a Christian.[2] That

Epistle be excluded from the Canon of Scripture, it would remain a historical monument of the feeling of the first century. No other writing is more largely quoted by S. Clement of Rome, whose Epistle was composed in or about A.D. 95 (Lightfoot *S. Clement* vol. i. p. 346 foll.).

[1] 1 Cor. xii. 31 foll.

[2] Some have maintained that "the doctrine of Baptisms and of Laying on of Hands" means the teaching given to men at the time of receiving these rites. The following clause makes such an interpretation impossible: the doctrine of resurrection and judgment cannot mean the teaching given at the time when men rise again to be judged; nor can the construction in the one clause be different from the construction in the other. At the same time the use of the plural "Baptisms" is hard to understand. Probably Delitzsch, Westcott, and others, are right in supposing that it means "the doctrine of Christian Baptism as compared with other Baptisms" (as in the case of S. Paul

this *was* S. Paul's view of the Laying on of Hands, as well as that of the author of the Epistle to the Hebrews, is seen from the passage in the Acts which has already been considered. The doctrine of the Laying on of Hands was to S. Paul also part of "the word of the beginning of Christ."

I find, then, in these words of the great unknown teacher of the close of the apostolic period a witness to the awful dignity of the Laying on of Hands, and to its intended permanence in the Church of God after those who first administered it had passed away. But, at the same time, he puts this sacred rite in no competition with Baptism. The way in which he introduces it binds it into one with Baptism, so that all its glories are the glories of that sacrament. As repentance and faith are one and yet two,—as the resurrection of the dead issues in eternal judgment,—

at Ephesus); otherwise it would not be impossible to see in it a reference to the individual experiences of those addressed, as if the writer had said, "the doctrine of each man's Christening." It will be noticed that "Laying on of Hands" is in the singular. There was not the same diversity of ideas to be dealt with in this case as there was in the case of Baptism. Dr. Westcott, indeed, appears to throw the phrase open, so as to include all the purposes for which the gesture was employed, although he considers it "not unnatural" to limit it in this instance to Confirmation. And as a matter of fact there is a substantial unity between all Impositions of the Hand, as being all solemn invocations of the Holy Ghost for one purpose or another. But in that case it would have been more simple, in conjunction with βαπτισμῶν, to have written χειροθεσιῶν τε or the like, as the teaching must have involved a discrimination between those various purposes; and, moreover, it is hardly likely that the doctrine of Ordination, for example, would, in reference to the individual life (which the author has alone in view here), be classed among the rudimentary, initial, fundamental necessities. The Laying on of Hands which formed part of Baptism undoubtedly was so.

so the doctrine of Baptisms is connected with that of the Laying on of Hands and includes it. The very order of the words in the Greek, and the choice of a connecting particle, show that this subtle master of a most expressive language was not thinking of two independent things which might be divided or thrown together at pleasure, but of one great institution,—Baptism,—to which a second thing was attached, forming naturally an immediate sequel to it,—the Imposition of Hands.

True to his own declared intention, the author does not stay to interpret the foundation things which he has named; and if it had not been for the two passages of the Acts, and the living witness of Church life, we should have been in the strange position of being told that the doctrine of the Laying on of Hands was a thing without which no Christian could hopefully start upon his spiritual career, and yet of having nothing to teach us what that doctrine was. But with the help derived from elsewhere, we are able to discern in the verses which follow, what the author understood by that doctrine. "For it is impossible,"—such is his reason for saying that an advance to higher studies of Christian truth must depend on God's permission,—"for men who were once enlightened and tasted the heavenly gift, and were made partakers of the Holy Spirit, and tasted what God has spoken, that it is good, and powers of the world that is to be,—and then fell away,—to renew such again unto repentance."[1] It is the meaning of

[1] Vers. 4, 5: *τοὺς ἅπαξ φωτισθέντας, γευσαμένους τε τῆς δωρεᾶς τῆς*

Baptism and the Laying on of Hands which he unfolds in these two groups of participial clauses. "To be enlightened" is in all early Christian writers a synonym of "to be baptized." "The heavenly gift" is, according to the best commentators, "salvation in Christ;" and the particle which joins this clause to the foregoing—not the same as those which join the subsequent clauses—expresses the close dependence of such "tasting" upon the being "enlightened." With the knowledge which we gain from the Acts of the Apostles, it is not difficult, then, to identify the "being made partakers of the Holy Spirit" with the inward part or thing signified in the Laying on of Hands; and the blessed and glorious experiences next described are such as are often said to result from the possession of that gift.

II. Having now seen, from these three standard passages, that the baptismal Washing, in the earliest days, was normally accompanied by the Imposition of the Apostles' Hands, and that the gift of the Holy Spirit is expressly said to be conveyed by the second act, and not by the first, we are enabled to see more meaning in another class of passages, where the benefits of Holy Baptism are spoken of as twofold, although there is no explicit mention of a double rite.

It will appear, when we come to examine the patristic teaching, that some famous doctors of old times classed among such passages the saying of our

ἐπουρανίου, καὶ μετόχους γενηθέντας πνεύματος ἁγίου, καὶ καλὸν γευσαμένους θεοῦ ῥῆμα, δυνάμεις τε μέλλοντος αἰῶνος.

Lord to Nicodemus, "Except a man be born of water and Spirit, he cannot enter into the kingdom of God."[1] They considered the immersion in the baptismal Laver to be the birth "of water," and the superadded gift of the Spirit, by Chrism, or by Imposition of Hands, to be the birth "of Spirit." With this interpretation I do not agree. It divides the act of the new birth into two separate parts, possibly sundered by a long interval of time, in a manner which is not only difficult to imagine, but which is in no way suggested by the words themselves,—for the words seem in the most marked fashion to emphasize the oneness of the birth "of water and Spirit."[2] Besides this, such an interpretation contains what seem to me two untenable notions. It evacuates the baptismal water, when separately administered, of all spiritual grace, making it a mere outward ceremony; and it identifies being "born of" the Spirit with the "receiving" of the Spirit. I cannot, therefore, see in the words of our Lord to Nicodemus any reference to Confirmation, except so far as "*seeing* the kingdom of God" is more than "entering into" it, and that whereas without Baptism we cannot so much as enter it, without the grace which is offered to us in Confirmation we cannot, even when within, see the glories of it. It seems simplest, therefore, to understand the being born of "water and Spirit" as re-

[1] S. John iii. 5: ἐξ ὕδατος καὶ πνεύματος.

[2] It is unfortunate that the Authorised Version inserts a second "of," thereby suggesting the possibility of division. Perhaps it was unavoidable that the article should be inserted before "Spirit;" but it still further divides what in the original is undivided.

ferring to the outward and inward aspects of the sacrament of the font.[1]

(i.) Setting aside, therefore, that passage, I take as the first in this second group of texts the reply of S. Peter to the inquirers on the day of Pentecost: "Repent ye, and let each one of you be baptized in (ἐπί *al.* ἐν) the name of Jesus Christ into remission of your sins; and ye shall receive the gift of the Holy Ghost; for to you is the promise, and to your children, and to all afar off whom the Lord our God shall call unto Him."[2] The promise spoken of is the promise of the Holy Ghost, bestowed that day for the first time,—the promise made through Joel, "I will pour out My Spirit . . . and your sons and your daughters shall prophesy; . . . and it shall come to pass that whosoever shall call on the name of the Lord shall be delivered; for in Mount Zion and in Jerusalem there shall be those that escape, as the Lord hath said, and among the remnant those whom the Lord doth call."[3] That Pentecostal shower, S. Peter declares, is not intended only for those on whom it first fell, but for all,—even for those who had crucified their Lord and Christ. Two steps are necessary in order to obtain the gift: first, a general repentance; second, a Baptism

[1] "Water," however, seems to suggest not merely the outward ceremony of immersion, but the inward purification of which the immersion is a symbol. To be born of water then would be to begin a new life as set free from the defilements of the past, while to be born of the Spirit would be to begin a new life as enriched with the very nature of the parent Spirit. But these two things are simultaneous and inseparable.

[2] Acts ii. 38, 39.

[3] Joel ii. 28, foll.

of each person individually. This Baptism will involve the confession by each person of the Christship of Jesus, and the calling upon His saving name; and it will immediately admit the baptized into the remission of his sins. Then, thus penitent and cleansed, the believer will be in a position to ask, and to receive, the gift of the Holy Ghost. While, therefore, S. Peter associates the great gift very closely with Christian Baptism—so closely that he does not feel it necessary to particularise any distinct act which will convey it—he yet speaks of Baptism as a condition of obtaining it rather than as the means, and while he ascribes other benefits directly to Baptism, appears to suggest that this benefit is something which comes after. No doubt, if we had only S. Peter's words before us, we might have supposed his "and ye shall receive" to express a grace of Baptism itself,—as he might with perfect truth have said, "Repent, and be baptized every one of you in the name of Jesus Christ, and ye shall receive the forgiveness of your sins." But, when we know what was the apostolic practice, and hear S. Peter speak of other blessings in a way which implies a more immediate relation to Baptism, the conclusion appears to be irresistible that S. Peter looked to impart the gift of the Holy Ghost—in Baptism, indeed, only not in that part of it which would convey the forgiveness of sins, but in that second part of it which we know as Confirmation.

(ii.) The extraordinary and probably unique[1] case

[1] Chrysostom thinks that Apollos, because he is said to have been

of Cornelius and his associates teaches us in precisely the converse manner, that the gift of the Holy Ghost is not to be identified with the grace which first makes us Christians, and that it in no way supersedes the necessity of that grace. As, in dealing with the converts of Pentecost, S. Peter spoke of Holy Baptism as qualifying for the reception of the Holy Ghost, so, in dealing with Cornelius, he speaks of the reception of the Holy Ghost as qualifying for Holy Baptism. "Can any one," he asked, "forbid the water, that these should not be baptized, who (οἵτινες) have received the Holy Ghost as we ourselves did?"[1] It is, indeed, difficult to understand how the Holy Ghost could be given to persons who still, if even for a few minutes, remained unpossessed of the initial blessings of life in Christ. Yet it is harder still to imagine that the Baptism which the Apostle commanded them to undergo was a mere form and used for form's sake. It is, for instance, inconceivable that at Cornelius's Baptism, the Imposition of Hands was used,—at any rate with the usual prayer before it,—seeing that the gift conveyed by it had already been vouchsafed.

"fervent in spirit,"—or "in the Spirit," as Chrysostom probably understood the word,—must therefore have received the gift before he was baptized. "Although," he says, "Apollos did not know all things, yet by his earnestness he had drawn down upon himself the Holy Ghost (ἐπεσπάσατο), as Cornelius and those with him did" (*Hom. in Act.* xl. pp. 282, 285, Migne). It is a curious instance of misapprehension. The case of S. Paul is much nearer to being a parallel; if indeed the Laying on of Hands which restored his sight was the same which conveyed to him also the gift of the Spirit. It preceded his Baptism. But the identification is by no means certain.

[1] Acts x. 47.

In like manner, there would appear to be something almost profane in going through the ceremony of Baptism, with its solemn invocations, if the baptismal grace had already been received. The mind is not satisfied with the suggestion of S. Cyril of Jerusalem, that S. Peter ordered Cornelius to be christened "in order that, the soul having been regenerated through faith, the body also might, through the water, partake of the grace."[1] Some other form of admission to the visible fellowship of the Church would surely have been employed. S. Peter would have commanded them rather to be admitted to the Breaking of the Bread than to be christened, if he had thought that their Christening would add nothing to their spiritual condition. But if this is so, then the baptismal gift cannot be merely a lower degree of the Confirmation gift, but differs from it in kind. If Confirmation is only a fuller effusion of that which has been bestowed in measure at the font, then it includes it as the whole includes the part, and when the whole has been received, there is no reason—indeed, no justification, —for asking for the part. But S. Peter expressly identifies what Cornelius and his associates had received with the Pentecostal outpouring upon himself and his fellow-apostles. No one can doubt that the Pentecostal outpouring, even if not the same as that which is given by the Laying on of Hands, includes it, and is the fullest development of it. If, therefore, the outpouring upon Cornelius did not supersede the necessity of the blessings bestowed in the baptismal

[1] *Cat.* III. §4.

Laver, it is clear that the Apostles regarded the graces conveyed by the two parts of Baptism as distinct and separable from each other.

(iii.) The language used by S. Paul in drawing out how "the sacraments of the Jews are types of ours"[1] shews that the Apostles regarded the two great sacraments of the Gospel as being each of them a double sacrament. By a double sacrament I mean one which consists not merely of an outward sign and an inward grace, but one which comprises two distinct acts and conveys two distinct benefits. "All our fathers were under the cloud and all passed through the sea, and were all baptized into Moses in the cloud and in the sea; and they did all eat the same spiritual meat and did all drink the same spiritual drink—for they drank of a spiritual rock which followed them, and that rock was the Christ." M. Godet here entirely misrepresents the symbolism when he says that "the material water played no part in the crossing of the Red Sea; we are not told that *rain fell* from the cloud upon the Israelites, nor that their feet were dipped in the water." Being "baptized in the cloud" meant something quite different from being "baptized in the sea." The idea is not that of an application of water in various forms. Probably the word "baptized" would not have occurred to S. Paul in connexion with the cloud, if it had not been for the simultaneous thought of the sea, to which it is more strictly applicable. Or, to go deeper into the Divine significance

[1] 1 Cor. x. 1 foll. The words are those of the analysis at the head of the chapter in the A.V.

of the events of which S. Paul speaks, the presence of the cloud alone would not have been a complete prefiguration of our Baptism,—indeed, it did not at all prefigure that part of it which is generally so called. Baptism is prefigured by the passing through the sea. As M. Godet well says, "That miraculous passage separated them thenceforth from Egypt, the place of bondage and idolatry, exactly as the Baptism of the believer separates him from his old life of condemnation and of sin." He might have added several other interesting points of comparison. But the strange thing is that so keen a commentator should have failed to observe how different is this part of the Exodus-Baptism from the other which S. Paul mentions. The passing of the Red Sea was a momentary act, never to be undone and never to be repeated, performed once and for ever,—having, indeed, abiding and most momentous consequences for the Israelite people, and yet an act isolated and past and gone. It was otherwise with the baptism in the cloud. The cloud (mentioned first because it led them *to* the Red Sea, as well as through it and after it) was no momentary shower. It was a constant presence. It guided; it overshadowed; it enlightened; it protected; it commanded. It was the symbol of the indwelling of the God of the covenant among His people. As such, then, it represents, not the washing of the Christian in the Laver of Regeneration, but the gift of the Holy Ghost, whose preventing grace leads us to Baptism, and makes our Baptism efficacious; but who remains with us and in us as an endowment

ISLES NAZA 7098

quite distinct from that which the baptismal Laver conveys. Yet, while the being baptized in the cloud and in the sea sets forth two distinct ideas which must not be confounded, S. Paul speaks of them as forming one single and undivided Baptism, teaching us thereby to see that in the Christian Church, likewise, it is a single and undivided Baptism which gives us the remission of our sins and the gift of the Holy Ghost, though the one benefit be given us in the antitype of the deep waters in which Israel was plunged, and the other in the antitype of that cloud which hovered over their heads.[1]

(iv.) In a later section of the same Epistle the distinguished French commentator whom I have just criticized, has caught the idea which in the earlier one had escaped him. "By one Spirit," says S. Paul, "we were baptized into one body, whether Jews or Greeks, whether bond or free, and all were given the same Spirit to drink."[2] Evidently the Apostle is speaking of two distinct relations set up between the

[1] It is beside my purpose to work out now the two parts of the type of the second sacrament; but I cannot agree with those who consider the "spiritual drink" to be the type of the gift of the Spirit. No doubt the Spirit is often spoken of under the figure of "living water," and it is, moreover, through the passion of Christ that we receive the gift; but S. Paul's express identification of the rock with Christ seems to me to require an exegesis which would connect the spiritual drink still more closely with the Redeemer's person; and the close parallel between the "spiritual meat" and the "spiritual drink" appears to me to point unmistakeably to the twofold mystery of which our Lord said, "My Flesh is true meat, and My Blood is true drink" (S. John vi. 55).

[2] 1 Cor. xii. 13: ἐν ἑνὶ πνεύματι ἡμεῖς πάντες εἰς ἓν σῶμα ἐβαπτίσθημεν, . . . καὶ πάντες ἓν πνεῦμα ἐποτίσθημεν.

Holy Ghost and us. In the first He is the active instrument; in the second He allows Himself to be (in a sense) the passive possession. I can hardly do better than reproduce Dr. Godet's note upon the latter phrase. After rejecting the notion that the drinking of the one Spirit is a description of the Holy Communion, he proceeds, "Or have we here again to do with Baptism? But the more natural and suitable the image of dipping and bathing was to the form of the baptismal rite, the more foreign to it is that of drinking or slaking thirst. Besides, the 'and' indicates a new fact. If the second proposition only reaffirmed the idea of the first in another shape, we should have had the two clauses put side by side without a conjunction. The new fact of which the Apostle is thinking appears to me to be the communication of the *gifts* of the Spirit which accompanied the Laying on of Hands given directly after Baptism. By Baptism," M. Godet adds, "the believer is plunged in the Spirit as the source of the *new life;* by the act which follows, the Spirit comes into him as the principle of certain special *gifts* and of the personal activity which will flow from them. The believer is first *dipped,* bathed, to die to himself and live to God; then he is *given to drink,* drenched with new powers, in order to be able to be of use to the whole entity of which he has become a member. These are the two sides of his relation to the Holy Spirit."[1]

[1] M. Godet is not correct in saying that S. Chrysostom interprets the "drinking" to mean the baptismal gift. I shall shew presently that he says much the same as M. Godet himself. M. Godet is not

I would not be understood to adopt every word of this note. It does not, for one thing, appear sufficiently to recognise that S. Paul *is* still speaking of Holy Baptism when he adds, "and were all given one Spirit to drink," though he is speaking of a second act in Baptism, not of the first. But the note,—all the more remarkable as penned by a member of a community in which, unless I mistake, the rite spoken of is not practised,—at least brings out clearly that the text requires us to think of two distinct moments in our Christian initiation, and of a double work of the Holy Ghost upon the soul.[1]

(v.) "When the fulness of the time came," says S. Paul to the Galatians, "God sent forth (ἐξαπέστειλεν) His Son, born of woman, born under law, that He might redeem those under law, that we might receive the adoption of sons. And, because ye are sons, God sent forth (ἐξαπέστειλεν) the Spirit of His Son into our hearts, crying, Abba, Father."[2] The repetition of the words "God sent forth" is very remarkable.

quite consistent with himself, however, in saying that the believer is here said to be "plunged in the Spirit" in Baptism. He had before, and more correctly, explained the ἐν ἑνὶ πνεύματι thus: "Le ἐν (*dans* ou *par* un seul esprit) indique le moyen, et le εἰς (*en* un seul corps) le résultat atteint." To be baptized with (or in) the Spirit does not appear in Holy Scripture to mean the baptismal gift as contrasted with that of Confirmation.

[1] Something of the same kind might possibly be seen in the sixth chapter of the Epistle (the richest of all the Epistles in the doctrine of the Spirit), where S. Paul says (verse 11), "But ye washed, but ye were hallowed, but ye were justified, in the name of the Lord Jesus Christ and in the Spirit of our God." The "hallowing" may perhaps be a distinct act from the "justifying." But the passage does not necessitate such an exegesis, and it seems to me a little forced.

[2] Gal. iv. 4, foll.

It marks two distinct stages in the work of drawing the world Godwards. It is no accident that S. Paul speaks of the mission of the Son, and of the mission of the Spirit of the Son, in the same terms. Not only does it, as Meyer points out, denote that the Spirit's personal relation to God is similar to that of the Son, but it also denotes that the one mission is an event of equal importance with the other. The effects of these two missions, as here described, are quite distinct, though closely combined. The mission of the Son redeems us from bondage and makes us sons. This is followed up by the mission of the Spirit of the Son, which makes us realise what our privilege of sonship is. Often as the two things are confounded, they are by no means the same. Bengel well says, "We received first adoption, and then the Spirit of adoption;" and again, "The position of sonship is followed by the indwelling of the Spirit, and not the reverse." It will be seen hereafter into what difficulties some of the Fathers fell by not observing this order which is so clearly marked in Scripture. It may perhaps be true that the Apostle is not here directly delimiting the two parts of the sacrament of Baptism. I think it most probable that when he says, "God sent forth the Spirit of His Son," he has in mind the one great permanent act of mission which bears the date of Pentecost. It stands in better parallel to the mission of the Son than the special moments at which the gift was imparted to this and that believer. Perhaps that is the explanation of the sudden and curious change—obliterated by the Vulgate and the

English Version—from "*ye* are sons" to "*our* hearts." The sequence is not logical; S. Paul, and those whom he means by "we," had not received the Spirit in consequence of the adoption of the Galatians to be sons; but, on the other hand, the Galatians did not personally receive Him on the day of His first outpouring, and therefore S. Paul instinctively substitutes the pronoun which represents the Church at large. But, although in the two main verbs he refers to the historic Incarnation and to the historic advent of the Spirit, he no less truly applies these two facts to the individual life when he speaks of our "receiving the adoption," and of the Spirit as coming "into our hearts." By the help of the other passages which we have considered, it does not appear to be rash to state that the former of these two blessings is conveyed to us by the sacramental Water, the latter by the sacramental Laying on of Hands. The two parts of Baptism are related to each other as the Incarnation (and Atonement) to the Pentecostal outpouring. By his choice of a title for the Holy Spirit,—"the Spirit of His Son,"—following upon the parallel mention of the sending of the Son, S. Paul emphasizes the unity of the whole work, and makes it plain that the second movement of God towards man is not independent of the first, but the completion and crown of it; but he shews no less unmistakeably that we shall do well to keep the two benefits unconfused in our minds.

(vi.) The last of this class of passages which I shall examine is the famous passage in the Epistle to Titus.

"But when the kindness and affection for man of our Saviour God appeared, not of works—those works done in righteousness, by ourselves—but according to His own mercy, He saved us through a laver of regeneration and renewal of the Holy Spirit, which He poured out upon us richly through Jesus Christ our Saviour, in order that being justified by His grace we might be made heirs, according to hope, of eternal life."[1] Many interesting questions might be discussed with regard to various points in these verses, but only one or two are of much importance for our immediate purpose. It is not certain whether S. Paul intended to make the word "renewal" co-ordinate with "laver," and dependent upon the preposition "through;" or whether he intended it to be co-ordinate with "regeneration" and dependent upon "laver." Did he mean that God saved us "through the laver of regeneration and through the renewal of the Holy Spirit," or that He saved us "through a laver which was a laver of regeneration and of renewal of the Holy Spirit?" I think that he meant the latter. The two abstract words "regeneration" and "renewal" pair better together than "renewal" would with the concrete "laver"; and the subordinate genitives would not match one another if we made "renewal" and "laver" parallel, for the "laver of regeneration" is a laver which confers regeneration, but the "renewal of the Spirit" is a renewal which the Spirit confers. Besides which, the symmetry of the two parallel clauses, supposing "renewal" to depend

[1] Tit. iii. 4, foll.

directly upon the preposition and alongside of "laver," would be still further marred by the appending of the relative clause "which He poured out on us richly." It appears, then, that S. Paul gives a double description of the baptismal water. It is a "laver of regeneration and of renewal by the Holy Ghost, which God pours out upon us richly." At first sight it may look as if the Apostle denoted one and the same benefit of Holy Baptism by two different words, and as if "regeneration" and "renovation" were synonyms. And, indeed, some passages come very near to saying so. When S. Paul, for example, says to the Corinthians, "If any man be in Christ, it is a new creation," the process might justly be spoken of under the title of "renovation."[1] But on the other hand, a comparison with S. Matt. xix. 28 will show that that creating anew still more exactly answers to the thought of a *παλιγγενεσία*—a new birth; while S. Paul's usage of the term "renewal" compels us in the passage before us, to adopt a quite different interpretation. "Be ye transformed by the renewal of your mind."[2] "Though our outward man decays, our inward man is renewed day by day."[3] "Ye put on," in Baptism, "the new man (*τὸν νέον*) which is being renewed (*τὸν ἀνακαινούμενον*) unto knowledge, after the image of his Creator."[4] In all these passages "renewal" is not, like regeneration, a single act, which begins a new life, but it is the constant process by which the regenerate creature is gradually assimilated to the ideal for which he was

[1] 2 Cor. v. 17. [2] Rom. xii. 2. [3] 2 Cor. iv. 16.
[4] Col. iii. 10.

made. So, in the Christmas collect, we pray that "being (as we are) regenerate, we may daily be renewed by the Holy Spirit." The two things, then, are not synonymous. And the second of them is said to be the result of the plentiful outpouring upon us of the Holy Ghost. While regeneration set up a new life within us, disencumbered of past guilt, and wholly reconstituting both our inward nature and our relation to all that surrounds us, the gift of the Holy Ghost began a lifelong transformation of character, which is still carried on by the same gracious energy. But, if I am right in my view of the connexion of the words, both these benefits have their origin at the baptismal laver. Though, from the comparison of other passages, we may feel certain that S. Paul would have traced that "pouring out"—the word is Joel's and S. Peter's—to the Laying on of Hands and not to the actual immersion in the water, yet the Laying on of Hands is so integral a part of the sacrament of Baptism that he speaks of the whole as a Laver which is characterized by the double benefit.

To sum up the general result of the study of these portions of Holy Scripture, it will be safe to affirm that Christian Baptism is constantly spoken of as the means of conferring upon us two different, though closely connected, benefits—two different modes of the operation of the Holy Ghost. We find, moreover, that in apostolic days Baptism consisted of two distinct sacramental acts, naturally symbolizing two distinct ideas, which acts are yet so closely associated that the name of the first includes by implication the

second. Furthermore, the two spiritual benefits correspond to the two sacramental acts, each to each. While no instance can be alleged in which the Holy Ghost is said to be given or received in Baptism by itself, the gift is expressly said to be given and received in the Laying on of the Hands. No words therefore can better describe the relation of Confirmation to Baptism, as expressed in Scripture, than those which are inscribed on the title-page of this work, and are taken as its thesis: "The Holy Ghost is given in Baptism by the Laying on of Hands."

It would seem natural, therefore, in looking at those words of Holy Scripture which do not explicitly name either sacramental act, but which point to a moment, not specified, when one or other of these spiritual gifts was conferred, to distribute the two gifts to the two acts respectively. Thus, when we read such words as these: "Such were some of you; but ye were washed, ye were hallowed, ye were justified, in the name of the Lord Jesus and in the Spirit of our God": [1]—"Ye died; and your life is hid with Christ in God": [2]—"If any man be in Christ, it is a new creation; the ancient things passed away; behold, they are become new": [3]—"Neither circumcision availeth anything, nor uncircumcision, but a new creation": [4]—"Having forgotten the cleansing of his old sins": [5]—and many others; we shall naturally think of the moment when the baptismal water was applied, and the soul passed from the world into Christ. On the other hand, the

[1] 1 Cor. vi. 11. [2] Col. iii. 3. [3] 2 Cor. v. 17.
[4] Gal. vi. 15. [5] 2 Pet. i. 9.

second of the baptismal acts will be suggested to us, when we read such as the following:—"The love of God hath been poured out in our hearts through the Holy Ghost which was given to us":[1]—"For ye did not receive a spirit of bondage again to fear, but ye received a Spirit of adoption, in which we cry, Abba, Father":[2]—"We did not receive the spirit of the world, but the Spirit which is of God, in order that we might know the things which were bestowed upon us by God":[3]—"Now He that doth establish us with you into Christ and did anoint us is God, who also sealed us for His own and gave the earnest of the Spirit in our hearts":[4]—"Only this would I learn of you, Was it of works of law that ye received the Spirit, or of the hearing of faith? . . . He that supplieth to you the Spirit and worketh miracles among you, doeth He it of works of law, or of the hearing of faith?"[5]—"In whom also, on becoming believers, ye were sealed with the Spirit—the Holy Spirit—of promise, which is the earnest of our inheritance":[6]—"To every one of us was given grace according to the measure of the gift of Christ":[7] "Grieve not the Spirit—the Holy Spirit of God, in which ye were sealed unto the day of redemption":[8]—"The Spirit which He made to dwell in us longeth even unto envy":[9]—"According as every man received this or that gift, minister the same one to another as good stewards of the manifold grace of

[1] Rom. v. 5. [2] Rom. viii. 15. [3] 1 Cor. ii. 12.
[4] 2 Cor. i. 22. [5] Gal. iii. 2, 15. [6] Eph. i. 13, 14.
[7] Eph. iv. 7. [8] Eph. iv. 30. [9] S. James iv. 5.

God": [1]—"And as for you, the unction which ye received from Him abideth in you": [2]—"And in this we know that He abideth in us, from the Spirit which He gave us." [3]

[1] 1 S. Pet. iv. 10. [2] 1 S. John ii. 27. [3] 1 S. John iii. 24.

SECTION II.

PATRISTIC TESTIMONY.

CHAPTER I.

THE APOSTOLIC FATHERS.

We leave now the New Testament Scriptures, and enter upon the subsequent history of the doctrine of Confirmation.

A considerable length of time elapses after the close of the canon in which little or nothing of importance is to be found upon the subject. Among the scanty remains of the Christian literature of the first century and a half there is hardly anything which bears on the doctrine of Confirmation. The Apostolic Fathers do not speak of it. Of Baptism itself they say but little; and though it may be assumed that Baptism, for them, included Confirmation, as a matter of course, there is no attempt on their part to analyse the constituent elements of the sacrament.

So far as I know, there is but one thing which even superficially looks like an exception to this silence. The ancient homily known as the Second

Epistle of S. Clement, which Bishop Lightfoot would date between A.D. 120 and 140,[1] speaks of "keeping the seal," and of "keeping the flesh pure and the seal unstained;" but as it speaks also in an earlier passage of "keeping our Baptism pure and undefiled,"[2] we are led to identify the seal with Baptism. And lest we should insist upon making out that Baptism is so called by right of the second part of it and not by right of the first, the language of the somewhat earlier Hermas appears distinctly to connect the term with the baptismal washing itself; "That seal is the water, into which men go down under the doom of death, but come up appointed to life."[3] Later usage also sometimes applies the title of the Seal to the act of christening, instead of limiting it to that of confirming.[4]

It is, perhaps, somewhat surprising that no mention is made of either Unction or Imposition of Hands in that passage of the *Teaching of the Twelve Apostles* where directions are given for the form of Baptism. The passage runs thus:—

"Now concerning Baptism, baptize thus. Having given all the aforementioned instruction, baptize into the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost, in running water. But if thou hast not running water, baptize into other water; and if thou

[1] *S. Clement of Rome* vol. ii. p. 201 foll.

[2] §§ 7, 8; comp. § 6.

[3] *Sim.* ix. 16.

[4] The epitaph of S. Abercius, Bishop of Hierapolis in Asia Minor early in the second century, also speaks of the "splendid seal" borne by the Christians whom he found at Rome; but the words are not further explained (Lightfoot *Ignatius* vol. i. pp. 480–482).

canst not in cold, then in warm. If thou hast neither [in sufficient quantity], pour out water thrice upon the head, into the name of the Father and Son and Holy Ghost. Before the Baptism let the baptizer and baptized fast, and any others who can; but thou shalt command the baptized to fast for a day or two beforehand."[1]

It is, however, fairly clear, in the first place, that this little manual does not profess to give an exhaustive account of the ceremonies to be observed. Certainly this is so with regard to the Holy Communion, and it may well be so with Baptism. And besides, the person or persons addressed in it are the laity, or the lower ranks of the clergy, to whom the Imposition of Hands did not pertain. In the case of the Eucharist, after giving a form of thanksgiving to be used by the ordinary celebrant, it adds, "But the prophets ye shall permit to give thanks at what length they will."[2] So, when the "prophet" was present at a Baptism, he would no doubt use the Laying on of Hands, although the *Teaching* does not prescribe for it. It will be observed at the same time that the *Teaching* has nothing to say about the grace or significance of Baptism, so that we cannot gather from it whether the gift of the Holy Spirit was expected in such a Baptism as it has in view or not.[3]

[1] § 7. [2] § 10.

[3] It may be added that the account in S. Justin Martyr, which has striking resemblances to the *Teaching of the Twelve*, has no mention of Confirmation, although it speaks of bringing the newly baptized from the place of Baptism to the assembly of the brethren and its president, to be prayed for (*Apol.* I. §§ 61, 65). Of this hereafter.

There are two passages in the Epistle of Barnabas which seem to connect the indwelling of the Spirit with Holy Baptism. The first follows upon a quotation of the first Psalm, where it speaks of the "tree planted by the water-side":—

"Observe how he united the water and the cross. What he means is this: 'Blessed are they that have hoped in the cross, and so have gone down into the water.' . . . And again another prophet says, 'And the land of Jacob was lauded above all the earth.' His meaning is this; he glorifieth the vessel of His Spirit." [1]

In the second passage he says:—

"I find then that there is a Temple. How it shall be built, therefore, upon the name of the Lord, learn ye. Before we became believers in God (πιστεῦσαι τῷ θεῷ) the dwelling-place of our hearts was corruptible and weak,—a 'temple made with hands,' in truth; because it was full of idolatry, and it was a house of devils (δαιμονίων), through doing all the things which are contrary to God. 'But it shall be built upon the name of the Lord.' Take heed, that the Temple of the Lord may be gloriously built. How? Learn ye. Having received the remission of sins, and having hoped upon the name of the Lord, we were made new, created all over again. Wherefore in this dwelling-place of ours God truly dwelleth in us. How? His word of faith, His calling of promise,

[1] § 11. It is, however, supposed by some, as by Rendall *ad loc.*, that in these last words the author refers to the crucified body of Christ, not to the bodies of the baptized.

the wisdom of the ordinances, the commandments of the doctrine, Himself prophesying in us, Himself dwelling in us, opening to us that had been enslaved to death the door of the Temple, which is the mouth, giving us repentance, He leadeth into the imperishable Temple."[1]

But besides the indication that to receive the Divine indwelling was one of the first privileges of a convert to the faith, these words throw no light upon the question before us. In the absence of evidence to the contrary, we should suppose that the ordinary mode of receiving the indwelling would be that which was employed by the Apostles.

These few words are all, so far as I know, that can be gleaned from the first century or century and a half after Christ for our present purpose. If the work of Melito, Bishop of Sardis about the middle of the second century, "On Baptism,"[2] had been preserved, we should, no doubt, have had ample evidence of the belief of the Asiatic churches within some fifty years of the death of S. John. As it is, we have to wait for the second century to close before we can gain clear and explicit guidance. It then bursts upon us with welcome distinctness in the pages of Tertullian.

In my examination of the patristic teaching about Confirmation, I shall endeavour roughly to group the authors cited, not according to a merely chronological

[1] § 16. The date of this epistle is probably about the end of the first century.

[2] Euseb. *Hist. Eccl.* IV. xxvi. 2.

order, but according to the churches to which they belonged. I shall not attempt—the materials would hardly allow of it—to carry this classification very far; but I shall divide the authors with whom I have to deal into four groups, (1) African, (2) Western, (3) Alexandrian, and (4) Eastern.

CHAPTER II.

THE AFRICAN CHURCH.

It will be conducive to clearness of effect if we take by itself, and first in order, the baptismal doctrine of the Church of Africa. Its independent position preserved in it a distinctive type of tradition, more self-consistent and free from foreign innovations than that of any other Western Church—even than that of Milan. Throughout its stormy history it was engaged in debates which bore upon the subject before us. And it has, besides, the honour of having given birth to the earliest treatise now extant, devoted specially to the sacrament of Baptism.

The treatise of Tertullian *De Baptismo* was written after he had become a priest, and before he left the communion of the Church—probably, therefore, in the year 198. It was called forth by the false teaching of a Gnostic prophetess, who took offence at the simplicity of the Gospel sacraments. Tertullian describes in order the baptismal ceremonies of his time and country. The baptismal immersion was followed by Unction, and the Unction by Laying on of Hands. All these were to him parts of Baptism; but the two latter were to him by no

means only ceremonial and figurative accompaniments of the former.

After a comparison between the pool of Bethesda which, when troubled by the angel, restored the diseases of the body, and the Baptism which heals the soul, Tertullian proceeds—

"Thus man will be restored to God after His likeness, who once had been after God's image. The image belongs to the temporal presentment, the likeness to the eternal reality (*imago in effigie, similitudo in aeternitate censetur*). For the man recovers (*recipit*) that Spirit of God, Whom at the creation he had received by the breathing of God upon him, but had afterwards lost through sin.

"Not that we obtain the Holy Spirit in the baptismal waters; but having been cleansed in the water under the ministry of the angel, we are there prepared for the Holy Spirit. Here again we have the guidance of a figure given beforehand: for John, in the same manner, was forerunner to the Lord, preparing His ways. So, also, the angel which presides over Baptism (*baptismi arbiter*) directs the ways for the Holy Spirit Who comes after, by the washing away of sins, which is accorded to faith when faith is sealed in the Father and the Son and the Holy Ghost. . . .

"Then, on stepping forth from the font, we are anointed (*perungimur*) with consecrated oil,—a custom derived from the Old Testament dispensation (*de pristina disciplina*), in which men used to be anointed priests with oil out of a horn, since the

time when Aaron was anointed by Moses; from which he is called a 'christ,'[1] from the 'chrism,' that is, the unction employed. And this unction gave His name to our Lord, being spiritually performed; because He was anointed with the Spirit by God the Father. . . . Thus in our case also, though the unction takes place in the flesh, the benefit is a spiritual benefit; just as, in the actual Baptism, the immersion in the water is a carnal transaction, but has a spiritual effect, in our deliverance from our sins.

"After that, the hand is laid upon us, in benediction invoking and inviting the Holy Ghost (*dehinc manus imponitur, per benedictionem aduocans et inuitans Spiritum sanctum*). If human skill can bring wind (*spiritum*) into water, and then by application of hands from above can make the conjunction of those elements breathe out another wind (*spiritu*) which produces a loud music, shall we say that God is unable, in His own organ (*i.e.* man), by means of holy hands, to awake strains of spiritual sublimity? This rite also comes from the Old Testament dispensation. . . . Then (*tunc*) that most Holy Spirit comes down willingly from the Father upon the bodies which have been cleansed and blessed; He broods over the waters of Baptism as if recognising there His ancient throne.[2] . . . As, after the waters of the Flood, by which the primaeval iniquity was purged—after the baptism, so to speak, of the world—the herald dove was let go from the

[1] Lev. iv. 5, ὁ ἱερεὺς ὁ χριστός. [2] Gen. i. 2.

ark to announce to the earth that the anger of heaven was appeased, and returned with the olive leaf, which even among the Gentiles is held forth as a sign of peace, so the spiritual effect follows the same order. When the earth, which is our flesh emerges from being washed after its old sins, the dove of the Holy Spirit flies to it, bearing the peace of God, sent forth from heaven, where is the Church prefigured by the ark."[1]

Twice besides Tertullian refers to the same varied benefits of Baptism. In his book *De Praescriptione Haereticorum*, enumerating the glories of the Church which he was soon to leave, he cries—

"Thence (viz. from the Holy Scriptures) she quaffs her faith; she seals it with the water, she clothes it with the Holy Spirit, she feeds it with the Eucharist, she exhorts it to endure even martyrdom itself, and she does not receive any in opposition to this doctrine."[2]

And in another writing, composed after he became a Montanist, he uses the sacraments as an argument that it is only through the body that the soul can be taken into fellowship with God:—

"The flesh is washed, that the soul may be rid of its stains; the flesh is anointed, that the soul may be consecrated; the flesh is sealed (signed with the cross), that the soul also may be protected; the flesh is overshadowed by the Imposition of the Hand, that the soul also may be illuminated by the Spirit; the flesh

[1] *De Baptismo*, § 5, foll.
[2] *De Praescr. Haer.* § 36.

is fed with the Body and Blood of Christ, that the soul also may be made fat from God." [1]

Tertullian's belief with regard to Baptism and Confirmation is remarkably clear. He regards Baptism itself as conveying the forgiveness of sins—most likely, though he does not say so, regeneration—but distinctly not the gift of the Holy Ghost. This gift he unmistakeably associates with the Imposition of Hands. What exact sacramental value he attached to the intermediate Unction is not quite so apparent. It had the effect of consecrating the baptized, and of admitting them to a share in our Lord's priesthood; but it was not, in his eyes, the vehicle of the gift of the Spirit. Probably he would have been at a loss to say whether it was one of the ceremonies of Baptism or one of the ceremonies of Confirmation.[2] The whole complex rite was, in his estimation, but one throughout, although each part had a distinctive

[1] *De Resurr. Carn.* § 8. Probably, to judge from the position which it occupies, the *signatio* here spoken of is the signing of the cross upon the forehead (with or without chrism) at the time of the Laying on of Hands. But perhaps Tertullian means to include also the ordinary use of the sign of the cross. Tertullian's word *perungimur*, in the passage above cited from the *De Baptismo*, which is not a mere synonym of *ungimur*, shows that that Unction (the only one he names) was not upon the forehead only. It seems to imply a copious anointing on the head, or possibly an anointing "all over," in various parts, such as was customary elsewhere.

[2] It is asserted, *e.g.* by Scudamore in Smith's *Dictionary of Christian Antiquities*, *s.v.* "Unction," that the unction spoken of by Tertullian is a baptismal unction, entirely different from that used at a later time in Confirmation. There is nothing in his text to support this theory. The later Unction was a special application of the same chrism in the moment of the Laying on of Hands, not something essentially different.

benefit of its own to supply. The gift of the Holy Ghost was given by the Laying on of Hands; but the Laying on of Hands was itself an integral part of Baptism; so that Tertullian could say that in the sacrament of Baptism man recovers the Spirit Which he had forfeited by sin, though not "in the waters." He shews no sign of even knowing that the parts of the sacrament could be administered at separate times.

It is well known that Tertullian's influence continued to be powerfully felt in the African Church in spite of his secession from it. S. Cyprian was in the habit of calling him his "master." In no part of his teaching did he more closely follow Tertullian, for evil as well as for good, than in his doctrine of Baptism—except that he did not share an objection which Tertullian felt to the baptism of infants.

That the Holy Ghost is given in that sacrament is plainly and frequently stated by S. Cyprian.

In one of his letters he shows the error of some who had taken to using water instead of wine in the celebration of the Eucharist. Water, he affirms, is constantly, in mystical language, to be interpreted of Baptism. In support of this position he cites the words of our Lord in S. John vii. 37, foll., and continues—

"And to make it more abundantly clear that the Lord is not there speaking of the chalice, but of Baptism, the Scripture proceeds to say, 'This spake He concerning the Spirit Which they that believed on Him were to receive.' Now it is by means of Baptism (*per baptismum*) that the Holy Spirit is

received; and so, after being baptized and after receiving the Holy Spirit, men go on to drink of the Lord's chalice."[1]

He says that evil spirits, like serpents that dread the water, are unable "to remain any longer in a man's body in which, being baptized and sanctified, the Holy Ghost begins to dwell."[2]

He will not admit that the gift of the Holy Ghost is a variable quantity, of which a person could have more or less. Either he has all or none. An infant's baptism conveys equal benefit with that of an adult.

"The actual grace which is given to the baptized, is not vouchsafed in greater or less volume in proportion to the age of those who receive it. The Holy Ghost is not bestowed by measure, but by the fatherly love and graciousness of God, and is the same for all."[3]

Baptism is as full and efficacious when ministered to a man on a sick-bed, as when ministered in open church.

"If it is supposed that they have obtained nothing at all, on account of having been only sprinkled with the saving water (*i.e.* instead of being immersed in it),

[1] *Epist.* lxiii. 8.

[2] *Epist.* lxix. 15. *Baptizare et sanctificare* is a very favourite expression of S. Cyprian's; see *Epist.* lxiv. 2; lxix. 1, 3, 8; lxxiii. 18. Comp. *Epist.* lxix. 2, *uiuificari et sanctificari;* ib. 10, *iustificare et sanctificare;* lxxi. 1, *abluendi et purificandi et sanctificandi;* lxxiii. 1, *abluendi et sanctificandi.* It looks rather as if the *sanctificatio* pointed to a second act in Baptism—perhaps that of Unction, or possibly of signing with the cross (see below, p. 29)—distinct from the first, which gives cleansing and life.

[3] *Epist.* lxiv. 3.

—if they are empty-handed and destitute of any advantage,—then let them not be deceived; if they survive the sickness under which they laboured and get well again, let them be baptized. But if they cannot be baptized, who have already been sanctified by the Church's Baptism, why are they to have stumbling-blocks set before them in the matter of their faith and of God's graciousness? Or have they obtained indeed the grace of the Lord, but in a scantier and smaller measure of the Divine gift and of the Holy Ghost, so that they are to be considered Christians indeed, but not put on an equality with the rest? Nay, nay; the Holy Ghost is not given by measure, but is poured out upon the believer in His personal fulness (*sed super credentem totus infunditur*)."[1]

But it must not be supposed from this that S. Cyprian would have disagreed with Tertullian's statement that the Holy Ghost is not given in the cleansing waters. The two parts of the baptismal sacrament were indissolubly bound together in his mind. Each was necessary to the other. Regeneration itself was not—or not completely—effected unless both acts were performed. The infants of whom he speaks were confirmed as soon as christened; the sick, as soon as they recovered. In the great controversy with regard to the rebaptizing of men who had received Baptism from heretics or schismatics, S. Cyprian had the distinctive meaning of the two acts forced upon him. It had been the custom of the African

[1] *Epist.* lxix. 13, 14.

Church—at any rate since the time of Agrippinus, and perhaps from a still earlier time—to treat such baptisms as absolutely null and void; but at Rome a compromise had been arrived at, and while the actual christening was accepted as valid, the convert was required to receive the Imposition of Hands. This Imposition of Hands was understood by the Roman party to be of the same character as the Imposition of Hands in absolution—a removal of the guilt of schism, and of all its attendant disabilities. But it appears never to have been quite clear in the Roman, or any other Church, in ancient days, that there was any essential difference between these two kinds of Imposition of Hands.[1] The Imposition in penance was looked upon as restoring to the penitent a lost gift. It was, in fact, a kind of repetition of Confirmation. This, then, was the way in which it was commonly supposed to be employed in the reception of heretics. It is possible that Stephen and Cyprian were technically at cross-purposes when they contended about the unreasonableness of recognising heretical Baptism and yet laying hands again upon the convert. Yet Cyprian's very mistake—if such it was—about the exact intention of this laying on of hands served to bring out what he himself understood to be the relation between Baptism and Confirmation.

Like Tertullian, S. Cyprian speaks of an unction of the baptized, with consecrated oil; although, like Tertullian, he leaves somewhat vague and undefined the specific nature of the benefit.

[1] See below, p. 179.

"The man who has been baptized needs also to be anointed, in order that receiving the Chrism, that is, the Unction, he may be one of God's anointed ones, and have within himself the grace of the Christ. And the oil, moreover, wherewith the baptized are anointed, is consecrated upon the altar by the Eucharist. But the creature of oil could not have been consecrated by one who had neither altar nor church. So neither can there be any spiritual unction among heretics, since it is proved to be impossible for any consecration of the oil or any celebration of the Eucharist to take place among them." [1]

Cyprian does not elsewhere mention the Anointing, which was evidently in his view a subordinate rite; but his language about the Imposition of Hands is as frequent as it is emphatic.

"Let the patrons of heretics and schismatics inform us," he cries, "whether they have the Spirit, or whether they have not. If they have, why are those who have been baptized amongst them to submit, on coming over to us, to the Imposition of the Hand for the receiving of the Spirit (*manus imponitur ad accipiendum Spiritum*), when they must have received Him already; for where He was, there He could be given? If, on the other hand, those without, heretics and schismatics alike, are unable to give the Holy Spirit, and on that account the Imposition of the Hand is used among us, that here they may receive, what neither exists nor can be given there, it is manifest that neither can remission of sins be

[1] *Epist.* lxx. 2.

given by means of those who are acknowledged not to have the Holy Ghost."[1]

Again—

"If a man could be baptized outside the Church, in the profession of a distorted faith, and obtain the remission of his sins, he could, in the profession of the same faith, have obtained also the Holy Ghost, and there is no necessity for him, on coming over, to submit to the Imposition of the Hand in order to obtain the Holy Ghost and be sealed. Either his faith could have obtained both gifts outside the Church; or else, while outside, he received neither of them."[2]

He thinks well to inform Stephen that it has been determined by the African bishops in council—

"That those who have been immersed outside the Church, and stained with the defilement of a profane washing among heretics and schismatics, ought, when they come over to us, and to that Church which is one, to be baptized; and that it is not enough that the hand should be laid on them for the receiving of the Holy Ghost, without receiving also the Church's Baptism. For it is impossible for them to be fully consecrated and to be the sons of God until they are born of either sacrament (*tunc enim demum plene sanctificari et esse filii Dei possunt, si sacramento utroque nascantur*); since it is written, 'Except a man be born of water and the Spirit, he cannot enter into the kingdom of God.'"[3]

He proceeds to allege the case of Cornelius and

[1] *Epist.* lxix. 11. [2] *Epist.* lxxiii. 6. [3] *Epist.* lxxii. 1.

his associates, whom S. Peter ordered to be baptized although they were already full of the Holy Ghost. In almost identical words he writes to Jubaian :—

"Those who come over from heresy to the Church ought to be baptized, so that in being prepared for the kingdom of God by a Divine regeneration, in the lawful, true, and only Baptism of the Holy Church, they may be born of either sacrament." [1]

Similarly he speaks elsewhere of the duty of "giving to those who come over from error and falsehood to acknowledge the true faith of the one Church, by means of all the sacraments of the Divine grace, the true unity and the true faith." [2]

Some of the opposing party were rash enough to refer in support of their custom to the action of the Apostles at Samaria. They had not, it was said, required the rebaptism of those whom they found there, but had only laid hands on them. It was easy for Cyprian to point out how different was the case of the heretics in question, from that of men baptized in the true faith, into the one Church, by a deacon whom the Apostles themselves had sent.

"And therefore, because they had obtained the lawful Baptism of the Church, it would not have been right to baptize them again. Only what was still lacking was performed by Peter and John—with prayer for them and Imposition of the Hand, to invoke and pour out upon them the Holy Ghost. And this is still our usage, that those who are baptized in the Church should be presented to the prelates of

[1] *Epist.* lxxiii. 21. [2] *Epist.* lxx. 3.

the Church, and by means of our prayer and the Laying on of our Hand should obtain the Holy Ghost and be perfected with the seal of the Lord (*signaculo dominico consummentur*)."[1]

The benefits of Baptism, as distinct from Confirmation, are thus enumerated by S. Cyprian :—

"From it is dated the beginning of all faith, and the saving entrance into the hope of eternal life, and the Divine good pleasure to purify and to quicken the servants of God. If a man can be baptized among heretics, he can assuredly receive the remission of sins ; if he receives the remission of sins, he is consecrated ; if he is consecrated, he is made a temple of God."[2]

To be made a temple of God, however, is not necessarily to receive His indwelling, as the next extract shews. S. Cyprian's clearest account of the relation between Baptism and Confirmation is to be found in the Epistle to Pompeius.

"If they attribute the effect of Baptism," he there says, "to the majesty of the name, so that those who are baptized in the name of Jesus Christ, anywhere and anyhow, are to be considered renewed and consecrated, why does not the baptized, in the name of the same Christ, receive the Imposition of the Hand also there, to the receiving of the Holy Ghost? Why does not the same majesty of the same name avail in the Imposition of the Hand which, as they contend, availed in the baptismal consecration? For if a man born outside the Church can be made a temple

[1] *Epist.* lxxiii. 9. [2] *Epist.* lxxiii. 12.

of God, why should not the Holy Ghost also be poured out upon the temple? For one who, getting rid of his sins in Baptism, has been consecrated, and spiritually fashioned afresh into a new man, is thereby made fit to receive the Holy Ghost (*qui enim peccatis in baptismo expositis sanctificatus est et in nouum hominem spiritaliter reformatus, ad accipiendum Spiritum sanctum idoneus factus est*). For the Apostle says, 'As many of you as were baptized in Christ, did put on Christ.' If a man baptized among heretics can put on Christ, much more can he receive the Holy Ghost Whom Christ sent. Otherwise, it makes Him that is sent greater than Him Which sent Him, to say that a man baptized without can put on Christ, and so make a beginning, but cannot proceed to attaining the Holy Ghost; as if either Christ could be put on without the Spirit, or the Spirit separated from Christ. It is another piece of foolishness, when the second birth, whereby we are born again in Christ through the Laver of Regeneration, is a spiritual birth, to say that a man can be spiritually born among heretics, among whom they deny that the Spirit is. For the water alone cannot wash away sins and consecrate a man, but only when accompanied by the Holy Spirit. So either they must allow that the Spirit is there, where they say that Baptism is, or there is no Baptism where the Spirit is not,—for there can be no Baptism without the Spirit.

"But what are we to think of the assertion that those can be sons of God who are not born in the

Church? For that it is in Baptism that the old man dies and the new man is born, is declared and proved by the blessed Apostle who says, 'He saved us by the Laver of Regeneration.' But if regeneration takes place in the laver, that is, in Baptism, how can sons of God be generated through Christ by heresy, which is not the spouse of Christ? . . .

"Moreover, a man is not born again through the Imposition of the Hand, when he receives the Holy Spirit, but in Baptism, so as to be born first and receive the Spirit after (*non per manus impositionem quis nascitur quando accipit Spiritum sanctum, sed in baptismo, ut Spiritum iam natus accipiat*), as was the case with the first man Adam. God formed him first, and then breathed into his nostrils the breath of life. For the Spirit cannot be received without the man first being in existence to receive Him (*nec enim potest accipi Spiritus, nisi prius fuerit qui accipiat*)."[1]

Here we have the converse truth to that which Tertullian had so perspicuously stated. "Not that we obtain the Holy Spirit in the waters,"—so wrote Tertullian,—"but having been cleansed in the water, we are prepared for the Holy Spirit." Cyprian matches this dictum with another: "A man is not born again through the Imposition of the Hand, when he receives the Holy Spirit, but in Baptism."

There is one point, however, in his baptismal doctrine which S. Cyprian appears not to have quite thought out. In some passages, as we have seen,

[1] *Epist.* lxxiv. 5, foll.

he speaks of regeneration as taking place "in the laver," as distinct from the Imposition of Hands In others, he dates it from the two parts of Baptism combined:—men must be "born of either sacrament," if they would be sons of God. In all probability S. Cyprian would have explained himself to mean that the regeneration conveyed by the laver was the new birth of justification, by which a man is released from his guilty past and enters upon a new career, being "born again," indeed, but only "of water;" and that in order to receive the "birth of the Spirit," which completes his regeneration, he must await the Imposition of Hands. But perhaps the discrepancy between his expressions may be accounted for without going so deep. It may be doubted whether Cyprian would have used the expression if he had been arguing against men who (as the Novatianists are said to have done) insisted upon Baptism but not upon Confirmation. It came more readily to his pen when he had to deal with men who conferred (as he supposed) the gift of the Spirit on persons who had never received the earlier degrees of grace. It was his point that Confirmation alone did not confer regeneration. He would perhaps have hesitated to say the same of Baptism alone. Still, his language, if taken literally, no doubt implies that the receiving of the Spirit in Confirmation is the same thing as the being born of the Spirit, which must be joined to the birth of water in order to constitute a son of God.

It certainly seems to be implied again in the

famous sentences in which he describes his own personal experience of regeneration. There had been a time, he tells his friend Donatus, when he thought it impossible "for a man to be born anew, and, being quickened into a new life by the washing of the water of salvation, to put away what once he had been, and, without dissolving the bodily organism, to change the whole man in soul and mind."

"But when, by the help of the life-giving wave, the stains of former time had been wiped away, and into my reconciled and clean breast the light from above poured in,—when I drank in the Spirit from heaven, and was restored into a new man by a second birth,—immediately, in a wonderful manner, things which I had doubted received new attestation; what had been closed to me stood open; darkness became lucid; ease was discovered in what had before appeared difficult; things could be done which I used to think impossible; so that I was bound to acknowledge that that which, being born of the flesh, lived before under the power of sin, had been earthly, and that now had begun somewhat of God, which was animated by the Holy Spirit."[1]

Unquestionably, S. Cyprian's Baptism must have been accompanied by the Unction and the Imposition of Hands. As unquestionably, the "drinking in of the Spirit," which he here speaks of, would, according to S. Cyprian's own usage, be referred to the last of the three baptismal acts. Yet the whole of the benefits experienced are gathered up in the word Regenera-

[1] *Ad Donat.* § 3, 4.

tion; which, therefore, included, in S. Cyprian's estimation, the gift of the Holy Ghost conferred by the Laying on of Hands.

The bishops at the Carthaginian Council which closed the Cyprianic phase of the question of rebaptism were too much under Cyprian's influence to be treated as independent witnesses; but Cyprian's language on the subject was repeated there by Nemesianus of Thubunas:—

"Our Lord Christ spoke with His own Divine voice, saying, 'Except a man be born again (*renatus fuerit*) of water and the Spirit, he cannot enter into the kingdom of God.' This is the Spirit Which moved in the beginning over the water. For neither can the Spirit work separately without the water, nor the water without the Spirit. It is, therefore, a wrong interpretation which some give, who say that they ought to receive the Holy Ghost by the Imposition of the Hand and so be admitted into the Church, when it is manifest that they ought to be born again by either sacrament (*utroque sacramento renasci*) in the Catholic Church."[1]

Two other expressions used at the same Council are worthy of notice. Secundinus of Carpos said that "upon strange children and the progeny of Antichrist it was impossible for the Holy Ghost to descend through the Imposition of the Hand alone, it being clear that heretics have no Baptism."[2] Vincentius

[1] Ap. Cypr. *Sentent. Episc.* § 5.

[2] *Ibid.* § 24. Most of the manuscripts (followed by Hartel) insert a *non* before the *tantummodo*, which makes it wholly unintelligible.

of Thibari thus describes the steps by which a man ought to proceed in order to become a full Christian: "First, by the imposition of the hand in exorcism; secondly, by the regeneration of Baptism; then they can attain to the promise of Christ; and in no other way ought they." Considering the point at issue in the Council, he appears to have meant by "the promise of Christ" (*Christi pollicitationem*) the gift of the Spirit in Confirmation.[1]

Until the rise of the Donatist controversy, the African Church has little more to add to the teaching of Tertullian and Cyprian upon this subject, Lactantius, indeed, has a sentence which appears to contain a reference to the twofold grace of Baptism. He says that immortality does not belong to man by nature, but comes to him afterwards, when he begins to follow after righteousness, and to look up to God and heaven.

"This takes place," he adds, "when a man, on being purified by the heavenly laver, puts away his childhood together with every stain of his former life, and receiving an advance of Divine vigour (*incremento diuini uigoris accepto*), becomes a full and perfect man."[2]

Judging by the tradition of the Church to which Lactantius by race, if not by residence, be-

The *non* does not appear in S. Aug. *de Bapt. contra Donat.* vi. § 59, where the words are quoted.

[1] Ap. Cypr. *Sentent. Episc.* § 37.

[2] *Inst. Diu.* vii. § 5. Possibly *incrementum* may be intended to have its full classical sense of the "makings" of a thing, like Vergil's *magnum Iouis incrementum.*

longed, it is natural to suppose that he meant the purification and the putting away of the stains of sin to belong specially to the laver, while the Imposition of the Hand conveyed that advance of Divine vigour which was to issue in perfect manhood. That he says no more is sufficiently accounted for by the character of the work from which these words are taken,—especially as Lactantius, according to S. Jerome, had defective understanding with regard to the Holy Ghost.[1]

But the next explicit witness to the doctrine of Confirmation is Optatus of Milevis, who wrote against the Donatist schism towards the middle of the fourth century. The Donatists were in the habit of quoting the current version of Ps. cxli. 5 as a prayer to be delivered from receiving sacraments at the hands of wicked men. Optatus—not, it must be owned, taking high critical ground—endeavours to shew that the prayer is the prayer of Christ, not of the Christian, and that the *oleum peccatorum* which He deprecates is an unction administered by any human hands at all, since all men are sinners.

"The Son therefore prays; let us see if the Father consented. This the Holy Ghost indicates and makes plain in the forty-fourth (45th) Psalm, where He says to none other than the Son, 'The Lord,

[1] Hier. *Ad Pamm. et Oc.* (tom. IV. part ii. p. 345, Martianay). It is not certain how much of Lactantius' Christianity was derived from men who were Africans like himself and his friend Donatus, and how much from Orientals at Nicomedia.

even Thy God, shall anoint Thee with the oil of gladness in another manner than Thy fellows.' The 'fellows' had been the priests and kings of the Jews, of whom we know that each one of them was anointed by men: but that the Son was to be anointed by the Father, God by God, according to His prayer, is announced and promised by the Spirit; and the Father fulfilled it at the Jordan. For when the Son of God, our Saviour, came thither, He was manifested to John in these words: 'Behold the Lamb of God; this is He Which taketh away the sins of the world.' He went down into the water—not because there was anything in God that needed cleansing; but it was right for the Oil that was to come after to be preceded by the water, in order to initiate, and to set in due sequence, and to fulfil, the mysteries of Baptism (*superuenturum oleum aqua debuit antecedere, ad mysteria initianda et ordinanda et implenda baptismatis*). When He had been washed and was in the hands of John, the sequence of the mystery was observed (*lotus cum in Ioannis manibus haberetur, secutus est ordo mysterii*); and the Father fulfilled what the Son had asked, and what the Holy Ghost had announced. The heaven was opened as God the Father applied the Unction. The spiritual Oil at once descended in the figure of a dove, and settled upon His head, and covered Him with oil, so that He began from thence to be called the Christ, as having been anointed by God the Father. And lest the Imposition of the Hand should appear to have been lacking, the voice of God was heard speaking from

the cloud, 'This is My Son, in Whom I am well pleased; hear ye Him.'"[1]

It is difficult to see from these words what S. Optatus understood to be the special benefit of the Laying on of Hands. At first sight Unction would appear, by his time, to have acquired a relatively greater importance than it had for Cyprian. It looks as if the gift of the Holy Ghost were now to be specially connected with it, rather than with the rite which succeeded it; and as if the Imposition of the Hand were to be regarded only as an attestation of sonship. We have already seen, however, that Cyprian and other Africans considered the Imposition of the Hand and the gift conveyed by it to be an integral part of regeneration and of its sacrament, and probably this is Optatus' thought as well. As the voice of God at the Jordan announced the Divine filiation of Christ, so the Laying on of Hands symbolizes the gift—which it also conveys—which makes us finally and completely children of God. This seems to be his meaning.

But we are not left wholly to conjecture. The place of Unction in the sacrament of Baptism is more definitely stated in another passage of the same book.

"Oil," says Optatus, "is a simple thing, and has but one name of its own; when it is tempered, it is called chrism, containing a fragrance which softens the skin of the conscience, driving out the hardness caused by sins,—which makes the soul new and

[1] *De Schism. Don.* iv. § 7.

smooth,—which prepares a throne for the Holy Ghost, that, being invited, He may there, all roughness being expelled, vouchsafe willingly to take up His abode."[1]

Optatus' language reads here as if he had Tertullian's treatise *De Baptismo* open before him. The *inuitatus*, the *libenter*, even the *sedes* and the *parat*—and in the earlier passage which I have quoted, the *superuenturum*—all appear to be taken from Tertullian. Certainly the doctrine is Tertullian's. The water does not convey the gift of the Spirit;[2] the oil does not convey it. The Unction is a preparatory rite. It makes the new-cleansed soul ready to receive the Spirit, so that then He may be invoked to take up His abode in it through the Laying on of Hands.

It may appear somewhat of a paradox to speak of the consistency of the tradition of the African Church on the doctrine of Baptism, when it is well known how complete a revolution took place between the days of S. Cyprian and those of S. Austin in regard to the baptism of heretics. Cyprian was prepared to go to any lengths short of schism in his determination to have heretics rebaptized. Austin, though with the deepest reverence for Cyprian, regards rebaptism as a thing which a secret inspiration of God leads all men to abhor.[3] Yet, on examination,

[1] *De Schism. Don.* vii. § 4.

[2] In v. § 1 Optatus thus enumerates the glories of Baptism pure and simple: "You have well praised Baptism;" for what believer does not know that Baptism is one and one only, the life of virtues, the death of guilt, the birth to immortality, the gaining of the heavenly kingdom, the haven of innocence,—to use your own expression, the shipwreck of sins?"

[3] *De Bapt. c. Donat.* v. § 6.

the difference is only on the surface. S. Austin is quite as peremptory as S. Cyprian in maintaining the utter worthlessness of heretical or schismatical Baptism, so long as those who have received it remain apart from the Church. It is something of a wonder that he (like others) should have been so eager in defending the validity, or rather the irreversibleness, of such baptisms, when again and again he insists that they confer no grace, no remission of sins, no new birth, no sonship to God, that the Holy Spirit is not present at them, and that the character which they impress upon the soul serves only to mark it for punishment. The dislocation in the African tradition is purely one of form, and not of tone or of doctrine. S. Austin's teaching on the nature of the baptismal graces is fundamentally the same as that of his predecessors, though there are characteristic differences of expression.

It would not be hard to show that S. Austin believed the Holy Ghost to be given in Baptism. There is, however, no passage, so far as I know, in all his voluminous writings, where this is affirmed of the sacrament of the Font by itself. His works contain no indication that the first part of Baptism was ever administered without the second. He speaks, as others before him, of the three—or four—"sacraments," of which Baptism is composed, together.

The following is a striking instance. A child at Uzalis, of which his friend Evodius was bishop, had, to all appearance, died unbaptized, but without fault of its mother. S. Austin relates how, by the help of

S. Stephen, whose relics were preserved at Uzalis, the child was brought back to life to be baptized.

"Immediately," he says, "she took him to the presbyters. He was baptized; he was consecrated (*sanctificatus*); he was anointed; he received the Imposition of the Hand. When all the sacraments were accomplished, he was taken."[1]

It is plain that Austin is here describing Baptism as he was accustomed to perform it, and to see it performed. It agrees exactly with the description given by Tertullian.

In another place, combating S. Cyprian's argument quoted above,[2] that schismatics have no altar on which to consecrate their chrism, and are therefore unable to confer the Christian graces, he says—

"How it comes about that God can consecrate the oil at the words which proceed from the mouth of a murderer, and cannot consecrate it upon an altar erected by heretics, I do not know. It means that the deceptive conversion of a man's heart raises no obstacle within the Church, while the deceptive erec-

[1] *Serm.* cccxxiv. It is not clear whether the *sanctificatio* which here intervenes between Baptism and Unction is a separate rite or not. It looks as if it were so. It may perhaps refer to the use of the sign of the cross either with or without the chrism. It would then throw light on the *signatio* spoken of in a slightly varying order by Tertullian (see above, p. 63), and on S. Cyprian's phrase *baptizare et sanctificare* (see above, p. 65). It is not certain that applying chrism in the form of the cross was an African usage. Some passages of Austin which have been taken to prove it relate rather to the ceremonies observed with catechumens, *e.g. Tract. in Ioann.* cxviii. § 5; *Enarr. in Psalm.* cxli. § 9; *de Catech. Rud.* xx. § 34; *de Peccat. Mer. et Remiss.* ii. § 42.

[2] See p. 68.

tion of a wooden board elsewhere raises an obstacle against His vouchsafing to be present at His own sacraments, although the insincerities of men are no obstacle. If, therefore, the Gospel saying, 'God heareth not sinners,' prevents the celebration of true sacraments by a sinner, how is it that He hears the invocation of a murderer either over the water of Baptism, or over the oil, or over the Eucharist, or over the heads of those who receive Imposition of the Hand? But these are all done and validly done by the ministry of murderers—that is, of men who hate their brethren—even within the Church herself. On the principle that 'no man can give what he does not possess,' how comes a murderer to give the Holy Spirit? Yet such an one baptizes within the Church. It is God, then, Who gives the Holy Spirit when even such baptize." [1]

The Holy Spirit is here clearly said to be given in Baptism, but the parts of such a Baptism have been named in detail—the Water, the Oil, and the Imposition of the Hand.

Elsewhere he is discussing texts which the Donatists were fond of quoting in proof of the nullity of Baptism received from sinful hands—that is, from ministers of the Catholic Church. Austin shows their inconsis-

[1] *De Bapt. c. Donat.* v. § 28. The somewhat curious insertion of the mention of the Eucharist between the Unction and the Laying on of Hands comes, no doubt, from the fact that in the passage which S. Austin is criticizing there is no mention of the Laying on of Hands at all, and S. Austin follows the order of S. Cyprian as far as it goes, adding afterwards what was necessary to complete the description of Church Baptism. The Eucharist is only mentioned at all because of its effect in the consecration of the chrism.

tency in admitting without rebaptism persons baptized by sinners of their own persuasion. The texts quoted do not, indeed, mention the Laying on of Hands, but Unction is evidently regarded, both by S. Austin and by his Donatist opponents, as a constituent element in Baptism.

"If in this passage (Jer. xv. 18) the sacrament of Baptism is to be understood, why are we to believe that ministers of their own that are 'liars' and 'faithless' neither give nor possess 'lying and faithless Water'? Why does the 'washing avail' in their case, when 'baptized by the dead' amongst themselves (Ecclus. xxxiv. 25)? How come 'sinners' ever to 'enrich with their Oil the heads' of others (Ps. cxli. 5)? Why, there, do 'dying' or dead 'flies' succeed in not 'destroying the sweetness of the Ointment' (Eccles. x. 1)? What privilege supports their 'deceitful ones,' their wolves in sheep's clothing, that 'the Holy Spirit of discipline does not flee' them (Wisd. i. 5)? or if the Holy Spirit has fled them, how comes He to be given through them to those who have been baptized?"[1]

From these passages it will be inferred that in Austin's opinion Unction was so inseparably united with Baptism that the validity of the one carried with it the validity of the other. There is another passage also in his works where he maintains, as in the two foregoing, that the grace of Unction does not depend upon the worthiness of the minister. It seems as if the incautious language of Optatus about

[1] *Contra Parmen* ii. § 21.

the "sinner's oil" had brought the Church into trouble, for Austin finds himself compelled to expose the fallacy of it:—

"It has often been believed that the 'oil of a sinner' means the 'oil of a man,' inasmuch as 'all men are liars.' But Christ's oil—because He had no sin at all—is not the oil of a sinner, even though it be administered by means of a sinner." [1]

Of the spiritual significance and effects of the baptismal Unction, Austin speaks frequently and fully. Sometimes it is to repeat the language of Tertullian and Optatus about the priesthood and kingship of the Christian, which he always makes a point of connecting expressly with that union between the Christian and Christ, which is established by Baptism.

"No one among the faithful, I suppose, doubts that the priesthood of the Jews was a figure of the royal priesthood that was to be—the priesthood which is in the Church—to which all are consecrated who belong to the body of Christ, the supreme and true High Priest. For now all are also anointed, which in those days was done only to kings and priests; and when Peter, writing to the Christian people, speaks of 'a royal priesthood,' he makes it plain that that people are suitably described by both the titles to which the unction was appropriated." [2]

Again—

"All who have been anointed with His chrism we

[1] *Serm.* cclxvi. 1.
[2] *Quaest. Euang.* II. xl § 3.

may rightly call christs; but inasmuch as the whole body with its Head is one Christ." [1]

Again—

"When it says, 'They shall be priests of God and of Christ, and shall reign with Him a thousand years,' of course it does not speak of bishops and presbyters only, who are distinctively called priests in the Church; but just as we call all 'Christians' by reason of the mystical chrism, so we call all 'priests,' because they are members of the one Priest." [2]

Discussing the heading of the 26th (27th) Psalm—*Psalmus Dauid prius quam liniretur*—S. Austin argues thus:—

"David was anointed as king. Only the king and the priest were anointed then. Those two personages were in those times anointed personages. In these two personages was prefigured the future King and Priest in one,—one Christ in both offices, and called Christ because of the chrism. But not our Head alone was anointed, but His Body also, which is ourselves. He is King, because He rules and leads us; Priest, because He intercedes for us. And indeed He is the only priest who is Sacrifice as well. He offered to God a sacrifice none other than Himself. For He could find besides Himself no reasonable victim, truly clean—as it were a lamb without spot, redeeming us by the shedding of His Blood, incorporating us into Himself, making us His members, that in Him we also might be 'Christ.' For this cause the anointing belongs to all Christians, whereas

[1] *De Ciu. Dei.* XVII. iv. § 9. [2] *Ibid.* XX. x.

in the former days, of the Old Testament, it belonged only to two personages. But thence it is apparent that we are the Body of Christ, because we all are anointed: and we all, in Him, are both christs and Christ, because in a manner the whole Christ is Head and Body together. That anointing shall spiritually complete us in that life which is promised to us: but this is the voice of one who desires that life; it is the voice of one who desires the grace of God which in the end will be completed in us; therefore it is said, 'Before he was anointed.' For now we are anointed in a sacrament, and by that very sacrament is foreshadowed something that we shall be; and that unspeakable somewhat that is to be we ought to desire, and to groan under the sacrament, that we may rejoice in that reality which the sacrament foreshows." [1]

S. Austin is fond of thus emphasizing the difference between the sacramental rite of Unction and the grace which it betokens and conveys. Thus, where he comments on the words of Ps. xlv., "God, even Thy God, hath anointed Thee with the oil of gladness above Thy fellows," after dwelling on the fact that this unction—peculiar to the Hebrew people—made Christ at once Priest and King, he proceeds to say—

"He was then anointed, God by God,—with what oil but spiritual? For visible oil is used in the sign; there is an invisible oil in the sacrament; the spiritual oil is within." [2]

The distinction thus made leads S. Austin to state

[1] *Enarr. in Psalm.* xxvi. *tit.* [2] *Ibid.* xliv. § 19.

precisely the nature of that spiritual or invisible oil which makes us priests and kings.

"The spiritual unction," he says, in discussing the language of S. John's Epistle, "is the Holy Ghost Himself, of which the sacrament is in the visible Unction. He says that all who have this unction of Christ know the bad from the good, nor do they need to be taught, because the unction itself teaches them."[1]

And a little lower down—

"The sacrament,"—or "mystery,"—"of the Unction consists in the invisible virtue itself. The invisible unction is the Holy Ghost. The invisible unction is that charity which serves as a root to any man in whom it is, so that however the sun burns he cannot wither. All that is rooted is nourished by the heat of the sun, not withered."[2]

[1] *Tract. in Ep. Ioan.* iii. § 5. S. Austin's reading here is clearly καὶ οἴδατε πάντες, not πάντα.

[2] *Ibid.* § 12. In the last three passages quoted, it is very difficult to see exactly what S. Austin means by the word *sacramentum*. In the first, *oleum enim uisibile in signo est, oleum inuisibile in sacramento est*, supposing the text to be correct, it looks at first as if he meant to say, "There is a visible oil in the sacrament, and there is also an invisible." But then the substitution of *sacramento* in the latter clause would be unmeaning. I take it, therefore, that by *signo* he intends the Old Testament symbol, by *sacramento* the New Testament mystery, or antitype of the symbol. The same kind of meaning must be given to the word, I think, in the third of these three passages, *unctionis sacramentum est uirtus ipsa inuisibilis*. It appears to signify, "the thing which S. John mystically means in this passage by the word 'unction.'" So in the second passage here quoted, *cuius sacramentum est in unctione uisibili*, the *cuius sacramentum* may mean "who is mystically denoted," rather than "who is sacramentally conveyed." The word is always a difficult one to deal with; and this usage—identifying, as it does, *sacramentum* with *uirtus ipsa inuisibilis*

Similarly, in dealing with the Donatists, he accuses them of mixing up the outward and the inward :—

"By this 'precious ointment' you would have us understand the sacrament of the Chrism It does, indeed, rank as a most sacred thing in the class of visible signs or seals (*signaculorum*), like Baptism itself. But it can be found also in men of the worst character, who waste their life in works of the flesh, and who never will possess the kingdom of heaven;—who, therefore, do not belong to Aaron's beard, nor to the skirts of his clothing, nor to any part of the material of the priest's raiment. Discern, then, between the visible holy sacrament, which is found alike in good men and in bad—in the one to reward, in the other to judgment—and the invisible unction of charity, which is the special property of the good Discern between these, I say; discern." [1]

A similar value is assigned to Unction, when Austin beautifully interprets the "oil which maketh a cheerful countenance:"—

"What is this making of the countenance cheerful with oil? It is the grace of God,—as it were a manifested shining. . . . It is a kind of grace given to men for men to see, to attract a holy love. This is called oil, in its Divine shining; and because it appeared in its most perfect excellence in the Christ, the whole world loves Him. . . . For such is His grace that many even who do not believe in Him, praise Him,

—is almost the exact opposite to the more frequent one where *sacramentum* is the outward sign as distinguished from the inward grace.

[1] *Contra Litt. Petil.* ii. 239. The *sicut ipse baptismus* shews at once the connexion with Baptism and the difference from it.

and say that their only reason for not believing in Him is that no man can fulfil what He commands. . . . Yet He is dear to all, renowned of all, because anointed beyond others, and therefore the Christ. For Christ means anointed; He is called Christ from the chrism:—in Hebrew, Messias; in Greek, Christ; in Latin, Anointed. But He anoints His whole body, all over; therefore all who come receive grace, that their countenances may be made cheerful with the oil."[1]

That S. Austin definitely looked upon Unction as being the ordinary mode of receiving the Holy Ghost, is made clear by his language concerning the sequence of the baptismal rites in addressing the *Infantes*, that is, the newly initiated Christians. He is preparing them for their first Communion. He has explained to them the symbolism of the "one bread"—how it is made out of many different grains of corn, which have been ground, and moistened, and baked.

"So you, also, were first ground, as it were, by the humiliation of fasting and the sacrament of exorcism. Then came Baptism, with its water:—you were moistened, as it were, to bring you into the shape of bread. But bread is not yet bread without fire. What, then, does the fire represent? It is the Chrism. For the oil of our fire is the sacrament of the Holy Ghost. Observe what we read in the Acts of the Apostles. The book begins to be read at this very season. . . . Observe, therefore, and you will see that the Holy Ghost will come at Pentecost. And He will come in this manner;—He shews Himself in fiery

[1] *Enarr. in Psalm.* ciii. § 13.

tongues. For He inspires men with charity, whereby we may be on fire towards God, and may despise the world, and the 'hay' in us may be burned up, and our heart be purified like gold. So the Holy Ghost comes next—after the water, the fire; and you are made bread, which is the Body of Christ. And therefore, in a way, unity is symbolized. Now you have the sacraments in their proper order."[1]

He repeats the same thoughts in two other sermons:—

"After that, you came to the water, and were moistened, and made into one. The heat of the Holy Ghost was added, and you were baked, and you became the bread of the Lord."[2]

Once more:—

"When you were exorcized, it was the grinding of you. When you were baptized, it was your moistening. When you received the fire of the Holy Ghost, it was the baking of you."[3]

It is especially instructive to compare these passages from three different *Sermones ad Infantes*. Had we possessed but the two latter, although we might have surmised from the parallelism of the sentences that S. Austin attributed the gift of the Spirit to a separate rite, yet it would have been open to us to suppose that he only referred to another side or aspect of "Baptism itself." The comparison with the first of these sermons makes it evident that when S. Austin spoke to Christians of their

[1] *Serm.* ccxxvii. [2] *Serm.* ccxxix.
[3] *Serm.* cclxxi.

having received the Holy Ghost, he expected them to think of their Unction.

Unction undoubtedly occupies a more prominent and definite place in the doctrine of S. Austin than it occupied in that of S. Cyprian, or even of S. Optatus. Not only does it serve—as others had taught before—to consecrate all Christians to be kings and priests. This might have been considered to be only a ceremonial recognition of prerogatives conferred in christening—especially when S. Austin so markedly connects the royal priesthood with incorporation into Christ. But Unction is for him the sacrament by which the Holy Ghost is given and received—something quite apart from the grace bestowed in "Baptism itself." Among the benefits of receiving the Holy Ghost in the sacrament of Unction he specifies knowledge, charity, attractiveness of life, fervour of devotion. This is a great advance upon the earlier doctrine.

At first it would seem as if Austin had left no room for the Laying on of Hands, and that it must be quite superseded by the twin ceremony of Unction. This is not the case, however. His language about the Laying on of Hands is no less explicit than his language about the rite which had encroached upon it. An important passage in the *De Trinitate* thus sets the two side by side without a sense of rivalry. He is proving the Deity of Christ by the fact that He bestows the Holy Spirit.

"How, then, can He be not God, when He gives the Holy Ghost? Rather, how great a God must He

be Who gives God as His gift? None of His disciples ever gave the Holy Ghost. They prayed, indeed, that He would come upon those on whom they laid their hands; but they did not themselves give Him. This usage is still preserved by the Church in the action of her prelates. . . . For this reason also the Lord Jesus Himself did not only give the Holy Spirit as God, but also received Him as man, and is therefore said to have been full both of grace and of the Holy Ghost. And it is written of Him more explicitly in the Acts of the Apostles, 'How God anointed Him with the Holy Ghost,'—not, to be sure, with visible oil, but with a gift of grace, which is signified by the visible unguent wherewith the Church anoints the baptized. Yet assuredly it was not then that Christ was anointed with the Holy Ghost, when upon His Baptism the Holy Ghost descended on Him like a dove; then, He was pleased to prefigure His Body, the Church, in which in a special sense those who have been baptized receive the Holy Ghost (*in qua praecipue baptizati accipiunt Spiritum sanctum*). But with that mystic, invisible unction He must be supposed to have been anointed when the Word of God was made flesh—that is, when human nature, without any merit of good works beforehand, was joined to God the Word in the Virgin's womb and made one Person with Him. For this cause we confess Him to be 'born of the Holy Ghost and the Virgin Mary.' For it would be absurd in the extreme to believe that He only received the Holy Ghost at thirty years of age. . . . [We must believe] that as He came to

Baptism without any sin at all, so He came not without the Holy Ghost.[1] . . . Again, where it is written of Him that He 'hath received of the Father the promise of the Holy Ghost and shed it forth,' both natures are indicated, the human and the Divine: He received as man, He shed forth as God. We on the other hand are able to receive this gift, indeed, according to our poor measure; but to shed it forth upon others is quite impossible for us. That it may be done, we invoke God over them, and He, and He alone, effects it."[2]

S. Austin was moved to adopt the line here followed, of maintaining that men could not give the Holy Spirit, by the exigencies of the controversy with Donatism. The Donatists insisted with a vehemence which scandalized him, upon the absolute necessity of the Laying on of Hands. "You say," S. Austin cries, "that never since the first hundred and twenty did the Spirit come without Imposition."[3] This contention of theirs was bound up with their favourite tenet that no grace could be expected except through a worthy minister. It became necessary, therefore, for S. Austin to show that the

[1] Washing from sin, and the gift of the Spirit, being the two blessings bestowed in Baptism.

[2] *De Trin.* xv. 46.

[3] *Serm.* cclxxvi. 6. Of course they would not administer it to Catholics who joined them without first baptizing them afresh. "For the Holy Spirit," said Petilian, their chief controversialist, "will not be able to be engrafted into any one by the Imposition of the Hand of the pontiff, unless the water which begets a pure conscience have come first" (Aug. *contr. Litt. Petil.* ii. 81). It was precisely the language of S. Cyprian.

grace of the Laying on of Hands no more depended upon the minister than that of any other sacrament. He appears never to be weary of reiterating that the gift of the Holy Ghost is not the gift of men. He frequently refers, in proof of this, to the various ways in which it is recorded to have been bestowed in the Acts of the Apostles. The instance of Cornelius is an especial favourite.

"While Peter was yet speaking,—I do not say before he laid his hand upon him, but even before he baptized him, and while those who were with Peter still doubted whether the uncircumcised ought to be baptized at all, . . . in order that this question might be removed by God, when Peter was speaking, the Holy Spirit came—filled Cornelius—filled those who were with him. And thus by the evidence of the mighty gift itself (*ipsa attestatione rei magnae*), proclamation was made, as it were, to Peter, 'Why dost thou hesitate concerning the water? lo! I am here already.'"[1]

The saint's language seems to imply that the gift of the Holy Ghost was—if not actually the *res sacramenti*, or substantive thing conveyed by Baptism—yet the thing towards the attainment of which Baptism was directed, as a preliminary step. Yet the words, *non dico, nondum imponente manum*, certainly shew that the Imposition of the Hand was the way in which that gift was normally to be expected, not Baptism itself.

"Thenceforward," he cries in a Pentecostal sermon, "the Holy Spirit began to be given through the

[1] *Serm.* xcix. 12.

ministry of the Apostles. They laid on hands, and He came. But this was not the men's doing; let not the minister claim any share beyond that of a minister. The bestower is one, the instrument is another. This the Spirit has testified, lest men should claim for themselves that which is of God. For in this way Simon wished to make himself of importance, who thought that the gift was to be ascribed to the men, and therefore promised the Apostles money, in order that the Holy Ghost might come at his own laying on of hands. . . . 'But,' say they, 'it was given by means of men.' Well, was it therefore the men's doing? 'But it could not have been given,' say they, 'except by the means of holy men.' Why, had it come into *them* by means of men? The Apostles laid on hands and the Holy Ghost came; but when He came to *them*, who laid hands on them?" [1]

So again—

"A hundred and twenty persons were gathered together. No man upon earth laid hands on them, but the Holy Ghost coming from heaven filled them. And when the order of the Church was now well established, the centurion Cornelius, before Baptism itself, before Laying on of Hands, together with those that were with him, was filled with the same Spirit, so that even Peter was astounded." [2]

Thus, again, defending the position that heretical baptisms were valid, and yet conveyed no gift of the Spirit, he says—

"And lest it should be thought a necessary con-

[1] *Serm.* cclxvi. 3. [2] *Contra Parmen.* ii. 34.

sequence that any one who has the Baptism of the Trinity must also have the Holy Spirit, therefore even within the unity of the Church a great distinction was made. We find that some who had been baptized acquired the Holy Spirit at a later date, when the Apostles were come to them at Samaria, having been absent when they were baptized. Others—of which case there is only a solitary example—received Him before Baptism, as while Peter was speaking the grant was made to Cornelius and those who were with him by that Divine power against which man can say nothing. Upon others He came immediately upon their Baptism, as upon that eunuch to whom Philip had preached Christ out of the Prophet Isaiah;[1] upon others, by the laying on of the Apostles' hands, as upon far the greatest number; upon others, by no laying on of hands, but while all were praying; upon some, neither by laying on of hands, nor at the prayer of any, but while all were listening to the Word of God. . . . Why, then, did He come now this way, now that way, except that we might not ascribe any part of the benefit to human pride, but all to the Divine grace and power? This distinction, then, between the receiving of Baptism and the receiving of the Holy Ghost sufficiently teaches us not to think that men are at once possessed of the Holy Ghost when we admit that they are possessed of true Baptism."[2]

[1] The text of the Acts used by S. Austin, as well as by S. Jerome, had the interpolation which appears, as a correction by the original hand, in the Codex Alex., "And when they were come up out of the water, the Holy Ghost fell upon the eunuch, and an angel of the Lord caught away Philip."

[2] *Serm.* cclxix. 2.

It is a pity that S. Austin did not tell us distinctly what he felt to have been the spiritual value of Baptism to men who, like the Samaritans, had received it with all right dispositions within the Church, and had not received the Holy Ghost. But these words shew how clearly he perceived that the two things are not the same, even in the case of worthy recipients. The gift of Baptism was not the gift of the Spirit; this was usually attached to the Laying on of Hands.

When we come to inquire what the saint thought to be the special benefits of this great gift so conveyed, we find him, naturally, adverting to the miraculous manifestations of the Spirit's presence in the early Church. These he declares, in his *Retractations*, not to have wholly ceased in his own time, and he regrets that words of his appeared to assert that they had.

"When the hand is laid upon the baptized, they do not now still receive the Holy Ghost in such a manner as to speak with the tongues of all nations. . . . But what I said is not to be taken to mean that no miracles are now done in the name of Christ."[1]

He strongly asserts, however, that these miraculous exhibitions were not of the essence of the gift, that they served a purpose for which they were no longer needed, and that there were more precious forms in which the reality of the gift was still displayed.

"Is the Holy Ghost not given at the present day, my brethren? Whoever thinks so, is not worthy to receive Him. He is indeed still given. Why, then, does no one speak with the tongues of all nations, as

[1] *Retract.* I. xiii. 7.

those spoke who in that day were filled with the Holy Ghost? Why? The reason is that the thing which was then signified, is now accomplished. . . . That little Church, speaking with the tongues of all nations, what else did it mean but this Church, so great, from the rising of the sun to the going down of the same, speaking with the tongues of all nations? . . . Let no one therefore say, 'If I received the Holy Ghost, why do I not speak with the tongues of all nations?' If you would have the Holy Ghost attend to me, my brethren. The spirit by which every man lives is called his soul, . . . and you see, my brethren, what the soul does in the body. . . . So is the Church of God. In some of the saints [the soul of the Church] works miracles; in other saints it utters the truth; in other saints it preserves virginity; in other saints it preserves conjugal chastity; in some one thing, in some other. All have their several functions, yet all live the same life. What the soul is to the body of a man, that the Holy Spirit is to the Body of Christ, which is the Church."[1]

But after all is said, the main exhibition of the gift received by the Laying on of Hands is charity.

"If thou discoverest that thou hast charity, thou hast the Spirit of God for understanding. This is indeed a thing most necessary. In the first days the Holy Spirit fell upon believers, and they spoke with tongues which they had not learned, as the Spirit gave them utterance. Such signs were suitable to the time. It was fitting that a sign of the Holy

[1] *Serm.* cclxvii. 3, 4.

Ghost should thus be given in all languages, because the Gospel of God was to run through all languages over the whole world. That sign was given, and passed away. At the present time, is it expected of those on whom the hand is laid that they may receive the Holy Ghost, that they should speak with tongues? Or when we laid hands on yonder *Infantes*, did you all look to see whether they spoke with tongues? And was there any of you so wrong-hearted as to say, on seeing that they did not speak with tongues, 'These have not received the Holy Ghost; for if they had received Him, they would speak with tongues, as was the case in those days'? If, therefore, the Holy Ghost does not testify His presence by such miracles at the present time, how comes a man to know that he has received the Holy Ghost? Let him ask his own heart. If he loves his brother, the Spirit of God abideth in him. . . . If thou wouldest know that thou hast received the Spirit, ask thine own heart, for fear thou shouldest have the sacrament without having the virtue of the sacrament. Ask thine own heart; if the love of thy brother is there, be of good comfort: love cannot be without the Spirit of God."[1]

In something of the same way S. Austin explains the use of the Laying on of Hands in the reception of heretics, which, like others before him, he identifies with the penitential use, but gives it the spiritual value of Confirmation. It was to bring them into Divine charity.

[1] *Tract. in Ep. Ioan.* vi. 9, 10.

"If, however, the Imposition of the Hand were not used for one coming over from heresy, he would in a manner be pronounced exempt from all blame; but for the sake of binding together in charity, which is the greatest gift of the Holy Spirit, without which all other holy things which the man may have had in his possession are of no avail for salvation, therefore the hand is laid upon heretics when they reform."[1]

These are great things to believe concerning the Laying on of Hands. Yet it must be owned that the line which Austin was accustomed to take in dealing with Donatism led him occasionally to use expressions of a somewhat minimising nature with regard to the very rite by which he believed the Holy Ghost to be ordinarily given.

It must be remembered that the heretics with whom Austin had to deal were for the most part Donatists. They had already received the Laying on of Hands from their own bishops. It was inevitable therefore, that the Catholic champion should find some reason to allege for not repeating their Baptism and yet repeating their Confirmation. The reason which he alleges is contained in the following passage, which forms part of his criticism upon Cyprian's famous letter to Jubaian:—

"When it is averred that 'the Holy Spirit is given only in the Catholic Church, by the Laying on of

[1] *De Bapt. contra Donat.* v. 33. The Benedictine note upon the passage next cited appears to understand the first sentence in this passage differently,—as if S. Austin meant that there would be no harm in omitting the Imposition of Hands. I do not think this interpretation will stand.

Hands,' no doubt our forefathers intended that we should understand what the Apostle speaks of,—'Because the charity of God is shed abroad in our hearts by the Holy Ghost Which was given us.' For this is that charity which is not possessed by those who are cut off from the communion of the Catholic Church; and accordingly, if they should speak with the tongues of men and of angels, . . . it profiteth them nothing. Those who do not love the unity of the Church, have not the charity of God; and accordingly we see that it is rightly said that the Holy Ghost is not received except in the Catholic Church. For the Holy Spirit is not now given with the attestation of temporal miracles, perceptible to the senses, through the Laying on of Hands, as formerly He was given, in order to carry conviction to uneducated faith and to enlarge the beginnings of the Church. For who expects now that those on whom the hand is laid for the receiving of the Holy Ghost should forthwith begin to speak with tongues? But we understand that invisibly and secretly the Divine charity is inspired into their hearts for the sake of the bond of peace, that they may be able to say, 'The charity of God is shed abroad in our hearts by the Holy Ghost Which was given us.' . . . Whatever heretics and schismatics may receive, the charity which covereth a multitude of sins is the peculiar gift of Catholic unity and peace. . . . But the Imposition of the Hand is not, like Baptism, incapable of repetition. For what else is it but praying over a man?"[1]

[1] *De Bapt. contra Donat.* iii. 21.

With this may be compared his description of the difference between "prayers" (προσευχαί) and "intercessions" (ἐντεύξεις) in 1 Tim. ii. 1:—

"Intercessions,—or, as your manuscripts have it, 'requests,'—are made when the people are blessed. For then the prelates, like advocates with those whose cause they take up, by means of the Imposition of the Hand, present them to the all-merciful Majesty."[1]

Thus the Imposition of Hands is, in S. Austin's view, an act of benediction and intercession,—not in its own nature unique and never to be repeated. He does not appear to feel that there are some prayers which can only be uttered once, and some blessings incapable of repetition, and that with regard to some acts of authoritative invocation it must be assumed that they have been heard, and that the grace desired has been lodged in the soul, which is thenceforth held responsible for it. Perhaps similar remarks to these of S. Austin about the Laying on of Hands might be made by another concerning Baptism itself, or the consecration of the Holy Eucharist, and it would be hard to meet them upon his ground. However, he does not seem to mean that the Imposition might be indefinitely repeated in the case of persons who had once received the gift of the Spirit within the Church —except so far as the same symbol might be used on their behalf, if necessary, in the sacrament of Penance. He only has in view the repetition of it in the case of penitent heretics.

To sum up what S. Austin says about Unction and

[1] *Epist.* cxlix. 16.

the Laying on of Hands respectively, the dogmatic relation between the two seems to be one of coincidence. They are not alternatives; both are used together, but both are used for the same end. S. Austin speaks of both as conveying, in absolute language, the Holy Ghost. The Holy Ghost brings the same benefits to the soul by means of either. S. Austin does not, indeed, speak of the Laying on of Hands as making the Christian a priest and king—which is especially suggested by Unction—nor does he speak of Unction as connected with miraculous gifts, which are especially associated in Scripture with Laying on of Hands. But this might almost be called accidental. There is no difference in the substance of the gift given in the two rites respectively. There is no difference in the main effects of the gift. The two rites are equivalent. Though it is probable that in Africa, on the return of heretics to the Church, a previous Unction is not repeated and a previous Laying on of Hands is, yet this fact does not at all mean that the one rite conveys a gift which the other does not. It indicates that Unction is more closely united with the baptismal washing than it is with the benediction which follows. Heretical Unction has, indeed, failed to convey the desired gift; but being essentially a part of Baptism, the remedy for its failure lies, not in repeating it, but in fresh prayer and the Imposition of more duly authorised Hands. And, at the same time, the use of Imposition of Hands for other purposes than that of Confirmation makes it doubtful whether S. Austin regarded the repetition of

this act as precisely the bestowal of a valid Confirmation in place of a former invalid one. It seems rather to have been an act of mixed character,—an act of reception into the bosom of the Church, of absolution from the sin of forsaken schism, of benediction upon the new beginning thus made; and by means of this entrance into the Church, all previous spiritual endowments, which had hitherto been useless, were set free and began to be of avail,—the baptismal washing, no less than the invocation of the Holy Ghost.

Such being, in S. Austin's view, the mutual relation between the two acts which constituted Confirmation, it remains to point out what was their common relation to what he calls "Baptism itself." All the direct evidence that we have on this point has been already given. Undoubtedly, both acts were to Austin a part of Baptism, in the larger sense. They were administered along with the baptismal washing. But they were no mere ritual adjuncts of it. The sacred laver, within the Church, conveyed the forgiveness of sins and regeneration, and therefore, it may be assumed, salvation where nothing more was to be had; but it did not convey that gift which the forgiven and regenerate soul expects for its completion. The gift of the Holy Ghost was, indeed, a baptismal gift, but given in that second part of Baptism which consisted in Unction and Imposition of Hands.

As I have said, S. Austin gives no indication that in his time any one was ever christened without all the baptismal rites being performed. He was not, therefore forced, as we are, to consider accurately the

position of a believer christened but unconfirmed. But there are passages here and there in his works which shew that he recognized a true gradation in the blessings which we owe to the operation of the Holy Ghost. One such may fitly close this examination of his teaching on Baptism and Confirmation.

"The first gift which comes into us from the bounty of God, for the attaining of the eternal life which will be given at the last day, comes at the very outset of our faith; it is the remission of sins. . . . That the Lord Jesus forgives sins by the Holy Spirit, even as He casts out devils by the Holy Spirit, may be seen from this,—that after His resurrection from the dead, when He had said to His disciples, 'Receive ye the Holy Ghost,' He added immediately, 'Whosesoever sins ye remit, they are remitted unto them.' For that regeneration itself, wherein takes place the remission of all past sins, is effected in the Holy Ghost, for our Lord says, 'Except a man be born again of water and the Spirit, he cannot enter into the kingdom of God.' But it is one thing to be born of the Spirit, and another thing to be fed of the Spirit (*aliud est nasci de Spiritu, aliud pasci de Spiritu*); just as it is one thing to be born of the flesh,—which is when the mother brings forth her child,—and another to be fed of the flesh,—which is when she gives it suck,—when the child turns to drink with delight, to live whence it was born, to receive the support of life from the same source whence it received its birth and origin. So we must believe that the first benefit of God's lovingkindness

in the Holy Ghost is the remission of sins . . . but perfect charity is the perfect gift of the Holy Ghost."

And a little further on in the same discourse, he says characteristically that remission of sins is given in the true Church and in it alone, "in order that, being rescued from the power of the unclean spirit, we may thereupon be made the temple of the Holy Ghost; and as, by Him, we receive pardon and are cleansed, so we may receive Him, personally, as our indweller, for the doing, the increasing, the perfecting of righteousness."[1]

The testimony of this great Doctor practically brings the African teaching upon the subject to an end. S. Fulgentius, the most important of subsequent African divines, though he has much to say on Baptism, and much on the gift of the Holy Ghost and its manifestations, nowhere, to my knowledge, directly examines the relation between them.[2] One of the last voices of North African Catholicism appears, indeed, to tell the same tale as those which went before him. Eugenius, Bishop of Carthage, writing from exile to

[1] *Serm.* lxxi. 19, 33. The last words are, *et a quo mundamur accipiendo indulgentiam, ipsum accipiamus habitatorem ad faciendam, augendam, perficiendamque iustitiam.*

[2] The nearest approach, perhaps, is where he says (*Epist.* xiv. 42) that the "oil" in Ps. xxiii. "is the courage, which cannot be taken away, of spiritual grace" (*spiritalis gratiae inseparabilis fortitudo*). He teaches, curiously enough, that it is possible for men to have the gifts of the Spirit, at any rate the miraculous ones, without having the Spirit Himself (*ad Monim.* ii. 9). It is his mode of accounting for such phenomena as are presented to us in the First Epistle to the Corinthians.

his flock amidst the terrors of the Vandal persecution, at the opening of the sixth century, says—

"Preserve therefore the grace of that Baptism which is but one, guarding the Unction of the chrism. Let none, after the water, go back to the water, when once born again of the water."[1]

But Eugenius does not explain further. He could afford to be silent, when the tradition to which he could appeal was so clear.[2]

[1] Apud Greg. Turon. *Hist. Fr.* ii. 37.

[2] It is now proved that the commentary on the Epistle to the Hebrews which goes by the name of Primasius, and which contains a striking sentence on the subject of our enquiry, was not the work of Primasius of Hadrumetum, nor of African origin at all. The reference to it will be found below, on p. 228.

CHAPTER III.

ROME AND THE WEST.

It is not impossible that more or less instructive results might be obtained by treating separately the traditions of Rome, of Northern Italy, of Gaul, and of Spain, in the same way as the tradition of Africa has been treated. Undoubtedly there were local peculiarities in the administration of Baptism, and varying tones of thought. Gaul had its affinities with the East; Spain with Africa. But not only would the materials be somewhat too scanty for a full statement on so limited a subject as the present; these Churches were more closely united together than Africa was with any of them, and the various streams were constantly mingling. I shall proceed, therefore, to examine the testimony of the Western Church as a whole.

The first great theologian of the Western Church was himself an Eastern. S. Irenaeus brought from Smyrna the traditions of S. John and of S. Polycarp to the banks of the Rhone. He was surrounded at Lyons by Asiatic Greek Christians. We may therefore suppose that his teaching on Baptism would be

much the same as that which must have been contained in the lost work of Melito of Sardis. What S. Irenaeus believed about it may be gathered incidentally from several pages of his great work against the Gnostic heresies, but he nowhere has occasion formally to state his belief. He mentions, at different times, both Unction and Imposition of Hands. Though his language about the latter ceremony does not prove that it was still in use in his time, and his language about the former does not prove that it was used in the Catholic Church, yet it is natural to conclude that both were so.

He describes the form of initiation into some of the Gnostic sects in a manner which shews that it was a profane improvement upon the Catholic rites.

"Some lead them to water, and baptizing them say this over them, 'Into the name of the unknowable Father of the universe; into Truth, the mother of all; into him that came down upon Jesus; into union, and redemption, and partaking of the powers.' And others say over them certain Hebrew names, with a view to producing a greater impression on those who are being initiated. . . . This is the formula repeated by the initiators. The initiated replies, 'I am now confirmed, and redeemed; and I redeem my soul from this world and all that comes forth from it, in the name of Iao, who redeemed his own soul, unto redemption, in the living Christ.' Then those present say, 'Peace be to all upon whom this name rests.' Thereupon they anoint the initiated man with opobalsamum. For this unguent they say to be a

symbol of the fragrance which is above all things. But there are some of them who declare that it is superfluous to take them to the water, but they mix oil and water together, and, with formulas of a like character to those given above, they throw it upon the heads of those whom they are initiating, and would have this to be considered the redemption. These also anoint with the balsam."[1]

It would be perilous to try to deduce in detail from these words what the customs must have been which were freely parodied by the Gnostics; but it is obvious that Unction was regarded as most intimately connected with Baptism, and succeeded it. The two rites together appear to effect "redemption." From the fact that no Gnostic imitation of the Laying on of Hands is spoken of, it might perhaps be gathered that the ceremony was either no longer used in the Churches where these sects arose, or else was not so prominent as the kindred ceremony of Unction. It must be borne in mind that the home of these sects was not the land of S. Irenaeus' adoption, but that of his birth. However, as Irenaeus' special point in this part of his work is to contrast the confusing discrepancies between the sects with the majestic unity of the Church, we must suppose that there cannot have been, within the knowledge of Irenaeus, any very marked divergence in these matters between East and West.

The chief passage in which he speaks of the Laying on of Hands is a singularly noble and

[1] *Haer.* I. xxi. 3, 4.

thoughtful exposition of the progressive method which God has adopted in His revelation of Himself to men. The writer has especially in view the accommodation to human weakness of our Lord's appearance in flesh.

'For this cause also our Lord, at the end of the times, summed up all things into Himself and came to us, not as He had power to come, but as we had power to behold Him. For He indeed had power to come to us in His incorruptible glory; but we had not power as yet to bear the greatness of His glory. And for this cause, to us, who were as babes, the Bread, the full-grown Bread of the Father, presented Himself as milk, which He did by His coming in human fashion, in order that we, being nourished by His flesh as by the breast, and being by such milk-work (*διὰ τῆς τοιαύτης γαλακτουργίας*) accustomed to eat and drink the word of God, might acquire power to retain within ourselves the bread of immortality, which is the Spirit of the Father. And for this cause Paul says to the Corinthians, 'I gave you milk to drink, not meat; for ye were not able to bear it.' That is to say, 'You have been instructed in the Lord's coming in human fashion; but as yet the Spirit of the Father does not rest upon you, because of your infirmity. For where envying and strife is among you,' he says, 'and divisions, are ye not carnal, and walk as men?' That is to say, that the Spirit of the Father was not yet with them, because of the incomplete and infirm character of their social life. As, therefore, it was in the power of the Apostle to

give the meat of which he speaks—for on whomsoever they laid hands, they received the Holy Ghost, which is the meat of life—but they were not able to receive it, because they had the senses of their soul as yet infirm and unexercised with the exercise which is towards God, so also at the beginning it was in the power of God to give to man that which was full-grown and perfect, but he, being but newly made, was unable to receive it, or receiving to take it in, or taking it in to retain it. And for this cause the Son of God, being Himself perfect and full-grown, made Himself as it were a babe with man (*συνενηπίαζε τέλειος ὢν τῷ ἀνθρώπῳ*), not because of Himself, but because of man's babehood, being so taken in as man was able to take Him in."[1]

I have quoted the whole passage, not only because of its depth and beauty, but also because without seeing the whole it would be difficult to express the way in which S. Irenaeus combines a vigorous grasp of doctrine with a curious misapprehension of historical facts, and even with a curious misapprehension of the way in which his doctrine applies. It will be observed

[1] *Haer.* IV. xxxviii. 1, 2. S. Irenaeus elsewhere also speaks of the gift of the Spirit as not given except to those whose lives are adapted for receiving it. It is the wedding garment of Scripture. "He has also made it clear that we must be adorned with His calling and with works of righteousness, in order that the Spirit of God may rest upon us. For this is the wedding garment. . . . Those who have been called to the supper of God, and because of their evil conversation have not received the Holy Ghost, will be cast out, He says, into the outer darkness" (Lib. IV. xxxvi. 6). It is certainly strange that with such a conception of the gift, Irenaeus should have thought that the giving or withholding of it rested so completely within the discretion of the Apostles.

that he has in view the passage of the Epistle to the Hebrews which describes the maturity of the spiritual "senses," and which, in the same context, speaks of the "doctrine of the Laying on of Hands" as known to every infant in Christ. Irenaeus supposes that the Corinthians had not received the gift of the Spirit, and that the reason why they had not received it was that S. Paul had not laid his hands upon them, because he saw that they were unprepared to receive it. It is, of course, improbable in the extreme that the Corinthians had not received the Imposition of Hands; and it is certain that they had received the Holy Ghost. S. Paul refers constantly to the fulness of His outpouring upon them. One of his chief complaints against them is that, knowing the Holy Ghost to be dwelling in them as in a temple, they profaned that temple by gross sins. A carnal mind was no proof of the Spirit having been kept back from them. But the mistake itself which S. Irenaeus makes serves the more clearly to shew what he understood the Laying on of Hands to be—or at least to have been. He cannot possibly have imagined the Corinthians to have been unbaptized. But not having received the Laying on of Hands, they had not yet, he supposed, "the Spirit of the Father resting upon them." [1]

[1] His only other reference to the Laying on of Hands occurs in his account of Simon Magus, where he repeats the language of Scripture, how that Simon thought that the Apostles "through the Laying on of Hands filled believers with the Holy Ghost by means of a superior kind of magic" (Lib. I. xxiii. 1). What he says about the unction of Christ accords well with the supposition that Unction was ordinarily used in the Church, and that the gift of the Spirit was believed to be received thereby. "The Spirit of God therefore

Yet the saint who so sharply determines that the gift of the indwelling Spirit is communicated by the Laying on of the Apostles' Hands, and not by Baptism, makes it clear that in his opinion that gift is a main part of regeneration, and therefore of the baptismal sacrament. In a chapter concerning the Holy Spirit, he says—

"Giving His disciples the power of regeneration towards God, He said to them, 'Go, teach all nations, baptizing them in the Name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost.' He promised through the prophets that He would pour out this Holy Ghost in the last days upon the servants and the handmaids that they might prophesy. For which cause also He descended upon the Son of God, made Son of Man, accustoming Himself, along with Him, to dwell in the human race, and to rest upon men, and to dwell in the being which God fashioned, working the will of the Father in them, and renewing them from their oldness into the newness of Christ. . . . And Luke says that He also descended upon the disciples, after the Lord's ascension, on the day of Pentecost, having power over all nations for entering into life and for opening out the New Covenant; whereby they combined to sing in all tongues a hymn to God, the Spirit reducing to unity tribes far apart, and offering the firstfruits of all nations to the Father. Whence also the Lord promised that He would send the Paraclete, Who should

descended upon Him,—of that God Who had promised through the prophets that He would anoint Him, in order that we, obtaining of the abundance of His unction, might be saved" (Lib. III. ix. 3). Taken by itself, of course, it would not prove the use of a sacramental Unction.

unite us to God. For just as dry wheat cannot be made into one lump or one loaf without moisture, so neither could we, who are many, be made one in Christ Jesus without the water which is from heaven; and just as the dry earth, if it does not obtain moisture, brings forth no fruit, so we also, being at first a dry tree, should never have brought forth the fruit of life without the 'gracious rain' from above. For our bodies have received that union, which is unto incorruption, by means of the Washing; our souls, by means of the Spirit. Wherefore also both these are necessary, since both profit a man for the life of God."[1]

Some twenty or thirty years later than the death of S. Irenaeus, and therefore about the year 225, a Roman bishop took up the war against the Gnostics, inspired (according to the account of Photius) by lectures which he had heard delivered by S. Irenaeus, probably in Rome. The work of S. Hippolytus bears the same kind of indirect testimony to the practice of the Church as is borne by that of his greater teacher. Speaking of the tenets of the Naassene sect, he says—

"For the promise of the laver is, according to them, none other than to introduce into the unfading pleasure him that is, according to them, washed with living water and anointed with unspeakable chrism."[2]

There is the same silence with regard to the

[1] *Haer.* III. xvii. 1, 2. The meaning of the sentences just quoted is not indeed so perspicuous as Irenaeus often is; but he appears, like some other Fathers, to consider the water of Baptism as conferring a benefit only on the body, with a view to its future resurrection, while the gift of the Spirit, not conveyed by the water itself, gives new life to the soul. This, however, may not be his meaning.

[2] *Refut. omn. Haer.* v. 7.

Imposition of Hands—the same close connexion between Baptism and Unction. And again the home of the sect is not the home of the writer. But the turn of the expression shews more unmistakably that the Gnostic sect had adopted for its own purposes a Catholic usage, with which the writer is identified.

We pass, however, into clear light with regard to the usage of the Roman Church when we approach the group of controversies which belong to the next generation and the age of S. Cyprian.

The first of these is the controversy with Novatianism. It is affirmed by the learned Theodoret that the followers of Novatian refused to practise Unction in administering Baptism.[1] Theodoret's direct acquaintance with Novatianism was probably not very great; and as he wrote two hundred years after the beginning of the schism, and in a distant country, there had been time and room for many developments since the date of its Roman founder. No other writer directly corroborates his testimony; and if what he asserts had been at all largely the case, we should have been likely to hear more of it in the discussions whether Novatianist baptisms were to be reputed valid. It would, however, be not unlikely for the partisans of the sect to take that line, if there is truth in the tale which was current about Novatian himself, that he had been christened on a sick-bed, and had never afterwards presented himself for Confirmation. The story is told in a letter of Cornelius, Bishop of Rome, to Fabius, Bishop of Antioch, preserved in a

[1] *Haer. Fab.* iii. 5.

Greek form by Eusebius.[1] It plainly expresses the doctrine of the Roman Church of Novatian's day upon the grace of Confirmation.

"What works, or what manner of life, did he rely upon, that he should lay claim to the bishopric? . His coming to be a believer was due to Satan, who visited him and abode in him for a long time. While under the treatment of the exorcists, he contracted a severe illness; and thinking himself to be at the point of death, he received [Baptism] by affusion in the bed where he lay, if indeed such a one can be said to have received at all. Moreover, when he recovered from the illness, he never obtained the remaining things which a man ought to partake of according to the Church rule, and was never sealed by the bishop. But never having obtained this, how could he have obtained the Holy Ghost?"

It has been much discussed whether Rufinus was right when he rendered the words τοῦ τε σφραγισθῆναι ὑπὸ τοῦ ἐπισκόπου by *nec signaculo chrismatis consummatus est.* Weighty reasons have been assigned for supposing that the "seal" which ought to have been sought from the bishop was rather the Imposition of Hands than the Chrism. But it seems to have been overlooked that Cornelius himself implies more than one act when he speaks of "the remaining things" (τῶν λοιπῶν). There can be little question but that Unction and Laying on of Hands are both implied, and that both together are designated by the

[1] *Hist. Eccl.* VI. xliii. 14, 15. It is quite possible that the letter was originally written in Greek.

name of the "seal" which follows. The particle τέ which connects τοῦ σφραγισθῆναι with τῶν λοιπῶν is the regular one for attaching an explanatory clause, and not a clause containing something additional. The "seal" is identical with "the remaining things." And without the "seal" it appeared impossible to Cornelius, and he supposed that it would appear equally impossible to Fabius, for Novatian to be reckoned as having obtained the Holy Ghost. The question asked by Cornelius is quite general. He does not cast any doubt upon the sufficiency of clinical Baptism as such. When he says, "If indeed such a one can be said to have received at all," he refers, not to the circumstances in which the baptism was applied to Novatian, but to his character and subsequent history, which appeared to shew that his baptism, however good in itself, had never been really appropriated by him. Cornelius does not mean that a man baptized in the face of the Church would have obtained without the seal what one baptized in bed could only obtain by means of the seal. Any one publicly baptized would normally receive the seal at his Baptism; but in any case, one who had not received the seal at the hands of the bishop, had not obtained the Holy Ghost.

If Novatian himself never received that Divine gift, yet few teachers of the early ages have spoken more clearly and richly about it than he has. He evidently had no doubt that his own Baptism had conveyed it to him.

"It is one and the same Spirit," he says, "Who was in the Prophets and in the Apostles, save that in the

former case it was for the moment, in the latter for ever. In the former case [He came] not to be always in them; in the latter, to remain in them always. There, He was distributed in a small measure; here, He is poured out in His personal entirety. There, He was given in sparing fashion; here, He is supplied abundantly. . . . This is He Who works the second birth of the waters, being as it were the seed of a Divine race, and the consecrator of a heavenly birth, the pledge of the promised inheritance, and a kind of title-deed of eternal salvation, to make us the temple of God and cause us to be His home;—Who intercedes for us to the Divine ears with groanings which cannot be uttered, fulfilling the duties of an advocate and performing the task of our defence; given to our bodies for their inhabitant and the effective agent of their sanctification, so doing in us to bring our bodies to eternity and to the resurrection of immortality, while He accustoms them in His own person to be conjoined with heavenly powers, and to be associated with the eternity of the Holy Spirit."[1]

His silence concerning the "seal" may be interpreted as in the case of other ancient authors who ascribe the gift of the Holy Ghost to "Baptism;" —Baptism implicitly including it. But, considering the accusations which were abroad concerning him,[2] it might be legitimate to treat his silence as evidence

[1] *De Trin.* § 29.

[2] The treatise was probably written before Novatian fell into schism, therefore we cannot be sure that these accusations were already current; but evidently Novatian had long been an object of envy at Rome before the rupture.

for the truth of Theodoret's statement that the Novatianists rejected Confirmation. This, at least, is certain, that if Novatian considered the seal not necessary in order to obtain the Holy Spirit, he was opposed to the current belief of the great Church whose bishopric he attempted to seize.

The other great ecclesiastical controversy of the age was that concerning Rebaptism. On this subject is preserved an invaluable anonymous treatise, which is printed in most editions of S. Cyprian, and in the fifth volume of Routh's *Reliquiae Sacrae*. The book has been ascribed to different dates and countries. It has been sometimes identified with the work of an African monk named Ursinus, who flourished about A.D. 440, and who, according to Gennadius, wrote in defence of the validity of heretical baptisms. Nothing in the treatise itself, except its main thesis, accords with that theory. The author speaks of himself as a bishop. He lived in days of persecuting heathenism. Instead of thrashing the dying carcase of Donatism, which must have been the occupation of Ursinus, he speaks of the controversy as now for the first time thrust upon the Church, nor is it possible to think that his opponents are in actual schism. Moreover, he pointedly speaks of the movement for rebaptism as started, and still headed, by a single man, a bishop, and in very high position, whom, however, he does not name. It is difficult to suppose this man to be any other than Cyprian himself,—unless, indeed, the date should be carried still further back, and the man be Agrippinus. Furthermore, the African

Church seems to have been so entirely agreed with Cyprian in his contention, that we should hardly expect to find a bishop of that date in Africa capable of writing so powerful a criticism on the prevailing party,—at any rate without notice of him in the correspondence of Cyprian, or in the Carthaginian Council. There is considerable reason for thinking that the treatise was originally written in Greek.[1] Rome was the head-quarters of the opposition to Cyprian's teaching on the subject, and the Roman Church was still in large measure a Greek-speaking Church. In the absence of evidence to the contrary, it seems safe to consider the anonymous tract *De Rebaptismate* as the production of one of the prelates in the entourage of Stephen.

Stephen's own opinion is contained in the following words which are quoted by S. Cyprian:—

"If, therefore, any come over to you, from whatsoever heresy, let no innovation be made upon the received tradition, that the hand should be laid upon them in penance."[2]

This position—though without much stress being laid upon the penitential aspect of the ordinance—is worked out in the anonymous treatise with a force and lucidity which make it stand high among the controversial pieces of antiquity. The whole work may be said to be a discussion of the relation of Con-

[1] See (*e.g.*) § 1, *plurimas quantas calumnias*, § 6, *aliquod scabrum fidem*. See also below, p. 129. If the translation was made in Africa, this would account for its supposed Africanisms.

[2] Cypr. *Epist.* lxiv. 1.

firmation to Baptism. The question to be examined is thus stated:—

"Whether, according to most ancient custom and the tradition of the Church, after a baptism received outside of the Church, yet in the name of Jesus Christ our Lord, it is enough for the hand only to be laid upon them by the bishop, for receiving the Holy Ghost, and whether this Laying on of the Hand furnishes them with the repeated and completed seal of faith (*signum fidei iteratum atque consummatum*); or whether, on the other hand, the repetition of Baptism also is requisite for them (*etiam iteratum baptisma*)—which would be to treat them as possessed of nothing, if this also is a thing which they never obtained at all."

The writer proceeds to examine systematically, as he hopes, the passages of Scripture which bear upon the subject. John, he says, whose authority in the matter is confirmed both by our Lord and by the Apostles, spoke of a Baptism of the Spirit which was to follow his own penitential baptism of water; and the Baptism of the Spirit is shewn to have been for the first disciples a Baptism of the Spirit only—the water being held to have been sufficiently applied by John. Such a Baptism of the Spirit, he goes on to say, is sometimes given secretly, and independent of all outward signs, and sometimes also along with the baptism of water, and sometimes with that of blood.

"To this, perhaps, you, who would introduce a novelty, may at once reply impatiently, as is your wont, that the Lord said in the Gospel, 'Except a man be born again of water and Spirit, he cannot

enter into the kingdom of heaven.' From which it manifestly appears that only that Baptism can avail, in which the Holy Spirit also may be (*inesse*); for upon the Lord Himself, when He was baptized, the Holy Spirit descended, so that His deed corresponded to His word; nor can this mystery hold on any other principle. No man on our side would be found so insane or so disloyal as to contradict this reply, in defiance of truth and right. . . . But if in the same New Testament the things which we here find united, should sometimes be found in a manner divided and apart, and in precisely such an order as if each were a thing by itself, it would be well to see whether they may sometimes take place singly by themselves, without either being thereby mutilated, but as being whole and perfect (*si huec quae in isto negotio deprehendimus adunata, nonnumquam reperiantur quodammodo diuisa ac separata et proinde disposita atque si sint singula, uideamus utrum possint esse aliquando etiam singulariter solitaria, quasi non sint mutila, sed tamquam integra atque perfecta*)."

Such instances are to be found, the author continues, in the case of the Samaritans whom the Apostles confirmed, and of the Apostles themselves, on whom the Lord did not breathe the Spirit till after His resurrection, long after their baptism with water. In these and other cases, though the Baptism with the Spirit was not at once given, the baptism with the water was sufficient to ensure salvation, so that a man would not have been lost if he had died in the interval between the two kinds of baptism.

"If you admit this, and believe it to be wholesome doctrine, and do not quarrel with the opinion of all the faithful, then you must needs confess . . . that, when Baptism in the name of our Lord Jesus Christ has preceded, the Laying on of the Hand of the bishop is capable, by itself, of conveying to a penitent and believing man from elsewhere the impartition of the Holy Ghost."

To deny that these benefits can be given separately, and given separately without risk to the recipient, is, he contends, to do one of two things—either to allow that others besides the bishops can bestow the Holy Ghost, or to imperil the souls of all bishops, at whose hands will be required the blood of those who die baptized but unconfirmed.

Indeed, sometimes the Holy Ghost is found to be given to believers without the baptism of water at all, as in the case of Cornelius, when faith alone performed the function usually performed by faith and Baptism together, namely, the purification of the heart,—as S. Peter afterwards said, "He put no difference betwixt us and them, purifying their hearts by faith." The baptism of water which ensued conferred nothing additional except "the invocation of the name of Jesus Christ."

To invoke this name is no light thing. It must not, of course, be supposed that heathens or heretics are at liberty to take it in vain, and that the mere invocation of it conveys salvation so long as the persons concerned remain in error. But it is open to them "to correct their error, and to come to the Church and to the

bishop, and to confess sincerely our Jesus before men, in order that then, when the bishop lays his hand upon them, they may receive the Holy Ghost as well, without forfeiting that original invocation of the name of Jesus, which none of us may gainsay." Then, the original invocation acquires its proper force. The circumstances in which it was first made are "no longer a hindrance to conferring the completeness of the seal —that which was lacking before being now supplied (*supplemento eius quod deerat accedente*)." It makes a great difference "whether a person has never been baptized at all in the name of our Lord Jesus Christ, or whether he was somewhat defective at the time of receiving the baptism of water, which is the lesser thing, so long as it is certain that his faith is sincere and true at receiving the Baptism of the Spirit, which is undoubtedly the greater."

What will the opponent say about those who have been baptized by bad-living, or by ignorant bishops, who deliver the Creed to their catechumens incorrectly? Must they be baptized afresh?

"But, most excellent of men, let us attribute and concede to the heavenly powers their proper force . . . and since our salvation lies in the baptism of the Spirit, which is very often attached to the baptism of water, in case we ourselves (*i.e.* the bishops) are administering the baptism, let it be perfectly and duly assured by means of all the things which are prescribed, and let it be administered without separating any one part from any other; or if, through necessity, it should have been administered by one of lower degree

in the clergy, let us await the issue (*i.e.* of the circumstances which called for such a baptism), that it may either be supplemented by ourselves, or reserved for the Lord to supplement. But if the baptism had been administered by aliens, let such correction be used as the matter admits of; because there is no Holy Ghost outside the Church, nor can there be sound faith either, among those in schism any more than among heretics; and therefore, when they repent and receive correction, and their hearts have been purified through the teaching of the truth and through their own faith now set right, they ought to be met only with the spiritual Baptism, that is, with the Laying on of the Hand of the bishop, and with the administration of the Holy Spirit. . . . If, contrary to the decree of the Apostles, we should presume to reduplicate the invocation of the name of Jesus, in our officious eagerness to give, or rather to superadd, Baptism,—then, supposing the man who returns to the Church refuses to be baptized again, we shall be in the position of defrauding a man of the spiritual Baptism, whom we do not wish to see defrauded of the baptism of water."

The writer then shews that the baptism of water is not a necessity for catechumens who are put to a martyr's death before they have an opportunity of receiving it. The double outflow from the side of Christ is a figure of the baptism of water and the baptism of blood, which are not to be regarded as two distinct things, but as divers forms of one and the same Baptism.

"And since," he pursues, "we seem to have divided

all Baptism into three modes, let us come to the proof of our assertion, lest we should seem to have done this rashly, out of our own notions. For John says, teaching us in his Epistle concerning our Lord, 'This is He Who came by water and blood, even Jesus Christ; not in the water only, but in the water and the blood: and it is the Spirit that beareth witness, because the Spirit is the truth.[1] For there are three that bear witness, the Spirit, and the water, and the blood; and these three agree in one.' From this we may gather that the water confers the Spirit, and their own blood confers on men the Spirit, and the Spirit Himself also confers the Spirit. For seeing that the water is poured out, and the blood in like manner, and the Spirit also was poured out by the Lord 'upon all them that believed,' no doubt men can be baptized, as with water, and equally with their own blood, so also with the Holy Ghost."

After a few good remarks upon the difference between the action of the Holy Ghost in this dispensation and in the Old, when "He was not communicated widely, nor with a free outpouring, but was shared with others, or at His own will fell upon selected men," —some of whom were unworthy of Him, but received Him for a special work and lost Him again,—the author sums up his argument thus:—

"So, in those cases where the Holy Ghost is associated with a Baptism administered by men, He

[1] S. Ambrose and S. Fulgentius, and they alone among Latin authorities, share the correct reading with the author of this treatise. It may be taken as an additional indication that the treatise was originally written in Greek.

sometimes precedes it, and sometimes follows it; or sometimes without Baptism being used at all, He falls upon them that believe; thus giving us counsel, either in the first instance to observe all that belongs to Baptism (*aut ex integro rite baptisma observare*), or in case it has been bestowed by some one—whosoever he may be—in the name of Jesus, we ought to supplement it without infringing the most holy invocation of the name of Jesus Christ."

The most salient feature in the doctrine of this able author is the confidence with which he distinguishes between the baptism of water and the Baptism of the Spirit, and unhesitatingly pronounces the second to be the greater; while he, as unhesitatingly, identifies the Baptism of the Spirit with the Laying on of Hands. If he says that sometimes the water confers the Spirit, his own language makes it plain that he meant on those occasions when the bishop himself baptized, in which cases the bishop would at once follow up the Baptism of water with "all those things which are prescribed." It may be noticed that he never explicitly speaks of Unction, though it is no doubt included in the general phrase just quoted. Baptism, though uncompleted by Confirmation, is nevertheless sufficient to secure salvation, so long as the recipient is in the Catholic Church or desires to return to it; and this, even if the formula be the defective formula which invokes only the name of Jesus Christ. Like his African opponents, he interprets the "birth of water and the Spirit" as equivalent to being "baptized with water and the

Holy Ghost," and therefore regeneration, for him, comprises the baptismal and the Confirmation gifts.

The three-quarters of a century which intervene between the Cyprianic age and the Nicene were not fruitful in theological authors, especially in the West; and I do not know that there is anything more to be examined on this subject for a considerable length of time, except two canons of two famous Western Councils.[1]

The Council of Elvira is now generally believed to have been held in the year 305 or 306,[2] at the close (so far as the West was concerned) of the last great persecution. In their seventy-seventh canon, the nineteen prelates assembled, among whom was the great Hosius of Cordova, agreed that—

"If any deacon governing a congregation (*plebem*) has baptized any persons without the bishop or presbyter, it will be necessary for the bishop to perfect them with his blessing (*episcopus eos per*

[1] Perhaps an exception should also be made for the "Scholia upon the Apocalypse," said to be by Victorinus, Bishop of Pettau, a Greek by birth, who suffered martyrdom in the persecution of Diocletian (about 305). It contains the following words (on Rev. v. 8) about the "new song" which could not be sung under the Old Testament dispensation, but which the Christian people sing. "It is a new thing that the Son of God should become man. It is a new thing that He should ascend into heaven with a body. It is a new thing to give to men the remission of sins; new that men should be sealed with the Holy Ghost. It is a new thing to receive a priesthood of sacred service (*sacrae obseruationis*), and to await a kingdom of infinite promise." But the Scholia, though there is doubtless a genuine foundation of Victorinus' work in them, have been so much interpolated that it is impossible to say whose words these are. There is no internal reason why they should not be his (see Routh *Rel. Sacr.* iii. p. 481.)

[2] See Dale *Synod of Elvira* p. 44.

benedictionem perficere debebit). But if they depart this life before, the faith with which a man believes will be sufficient to justify him (*sub fide qua quis credidit poterit esse iustus*)."

This curious canon, which appears to indicate that no such "benediction" is necessary if the baptism has been performed by a presbyter, sets very clearly forth the unity of Baptism and its "perfecting." The Council seems to have regarded the deacon's baptism as purely provisional. It does not base the salvation of the recipient upon the sufficiency of such a baptism in itself, but upon the right dispositions with which it was received. His faith has saved him. It looks, therefore, as if these Fathers had held the opinion that not only the strictly confirming gift, but the full baptismal regeneration also, was not to be expected without the bishop's presence.[1]

The Council of Arles was held in the year 314. It is the more interesting to us, inasmuch as the British Church was represented at it. In its eighth canon, this Council affirmed the position so strenuously asserted by the author of the *De Rebaptismate*, that in the case of a heretic who is found, on coming over, to have been baptized in the Threefold Name, "the hand only is to be laid upon him, that he may receive the Holy Ghost."[2]

[1] The 38th canon of the same Council prescribes the same "perfecting" by the bishop after baptism administered by a layman (*per manus impositionem perfici*).

[2] An earlier canon (VI.), which is often quoted as applying to Confirmation, refers, I believe, to the admission to the catechumenate. It contains nothing doctrinal.

The next divine whose works are to pass in review is the great Hilary of Poitiers. Himself one of the freest of Christian thinkers, he not only inherited the large Gallican traditions in which East and West were mingled, but he added the experience of Greek thought gained by his long exile in the East. He was, besides, a student of the earlier Greek theologians, especially of Origen.

Like others, S. Hilary speaks of the Holy Ghost as given in Baptism, the gift being, apparently, a part of Christian regeneration. He thus expounds the words of the Psalm, *Riuos eius inebria, multiplica genimina eius*:—

"We ourselves are thus 'inebriated,' when we receive the Holy Ghost, Who is called 'the River.' Then, because there flow out from us various 'streams' of graces, the prophet prays that the Lord would inebriate these streams, that, they being inebriated and flooded with the bestowal of the Divine gift, our 'produce' may be 'multiplied.' . . . Undoubtedly, when we have been new-born (*renatis*) through the sacrament of Baptism, we experience the greatest joy, on feeling within us some beginnings of the Holy Ghost, when there comes to us the understanding of mysteries, the knowledge of prophecy, the word of wisdom, the assurance of hope, the gifts (*charismata*) of healing, and the dominion over subject devils." [1]

There is, however, an ambiguity about the Latin *renatis*, which would leave room for us to suppose

[1] *Tract. in Psalm.* lxiv. § 15.

that the experience of which S. Hilary speaks is one which follows upon the new birth rather than constitutes an element in it. At any rate, other passages in his writings shew that he was aware of a difference between Baptism and the gift of the Spirit. Thus he says:—

"And perhaps, if a man imagines that in the sacrament of Baptism he has had restored to him that perfect purity of innocence which is worthy of eternal life, he may recollect that John the Baptist said, 'I indeed baptize you in the water of penitence; but He that cometh after me is mightier than I; He shall baptize you in the Holy Ghost and in fire;'—he may remember also that the Lord Himself, after His Baptism by John, being yet in the body, spoke thus, 'I have yet to be baptized with another baptism.' So far as we can judge, therefore, the cleansing which gives that perfect purity remains in store for us even after the waters of Baptism (*est etiam post baptismi aquas reposita*), to sanctify us by the coming of the Holy Ghost, to melt us by the fire of judgment; it will purify us through the ravages of death from the contagion and fellowship of that which is dead; it will wash by the self-devoted suffering and faithful blood of martyrdom."[1]

It is not necessary to conclude from these words that in S. Hilary's opinion Christian Baptism, apart from Confirmation, was only on a level with John's. The point is, that whatever the benefits of such Baptism might be, they required, in his view, a sub-

[1] *Tract. in Psalm.* cxviii. *litt.* iii. § 5.

sequent completion. He mentions several ways in which such a completion might be given, of which the first is the "coming of the Holy Ghost."[1] The Benedictine editors without hesitation consider him to mean by this the sacrament of Confirmation.

That view is borne out by the words in which he applies the lesson of Christ's Baptism to us;—words which remind us of the language of his contemporary Optatus in dealing with the same subject:—

"Even the order of the heavenly secret is expressed in Him. For when He is now baptized, and the avenues of heaven are thrown open, the Holy Ghost is sent forth, and is recognized in the visible aspect of a dove, and He is covered (*perfunditur*) with such an unction of His Father's love. Thereupon a Voice from heaven speaks thus: 'Thou art My Son; this day have I begotten Thee,' . . . in order that we, by those things which were fully completed in the case of Christ, might understand, that after the washing of water, and from the gates of heaven, the Holy Ghost flies down upon us also, and

[1] S. Hilary is fond of dwelling upon these various kinds of baptisms. Thus, in his *Comment. in Matt.* ii. § 4, he says that John, in declaring himself unworthy to bear Christ's shoes, contrasted his own office with that of the Apostles, and adds, "He indicates the time of our salvation and of judgment in saying of the Lord, 'He shall baptize you in the Holy Ghost and fire,' because for those who have been baptized in the Holy Ghost it remains to be consummated by the fire of judgment." Cf. *Comment. in Matt.* iv. § 10, where the Apostles are the "salt,"—which is a compound of fire and water,—"conferring immortality on all the bodies upon which their word was strewn, and, as John testified above, being perfected by the sacrament of water and fire" (*sacramento aquae ignisque, i.e.* the thing mystically meant by water and fire).

we are covered with the unction of the heavenly glory, and are by the Divine Voice adopting us made sons of God; for the truth, by things thus actually done, has prefigured a type of the sacrament which for us was to follow the same sequence."[1]

Elsewhere, he appears to disjoin the gift of the Spirit from Holy Baptism, as if it were conferred by a different sacrament, when he says, speaking of the rain and of the sun with which all alike are favoured:—

"He calls us therefore to the imitation, as well as to the inheritance, of God, Who, by the coming of His Christ, bestows upon the good and upon the unjust, in the sacraments of Baptism and of the Spirit, both sun and rain."[2]

The word *sacramenta* is, of course, not to be pressed as if it had acquired, in Hilary's time, its conventional meaning in modern language, nor does it even necessarily imply an external rite at all; but it would be hard to imagine that Hilary would so markedly have compared Baptism to the sun, and the gift of the Spirit to the rain, and connected them with the plural "sacraments," if it had been his ordinary teaching that the Spirit was conveyed by the baptismal washing. That such was not his teaching has been already seen from the way in which he insists upon the observance of the right order of the sacrament, in which the gift comes after the washing.

Thus far Hilary has not shewn us what other rites besides the washing were in his mind. He has

[1] *Comment. in Matt.* ii. § 6. [2] *Ibid.* iv. § 27.

only used phrases which, like 'the remaining things" of Cornelius, and the "all things which are prescribed" of the *De Rebaptismate*, indicate a series of actions. It may be supposed, by knowledge derived from elsewhere, and from his language above cited concerning the Baptism of our Lord, that Unction was one of these actions; but he nowhere expressly speaks of it. Of the Laying on of Hands he speaks in direct connexion with the gift. The infants upon whom Christ laid hands were, in his view, a type of the Gentiles:—

"Who, the Lord says, were not to be forbidden, because of such is the kingdom of heaven. For the bestowal and gift of the Holy Ghost was to be vouchsafed to the Gentiles, without the work of the Law, by means of the Laying on of the Hand and prayer."[1]

And lest it should seem as if Hilary was thinking only of a thing of the past,—as if the Apostles themselves alone thus communicated the gift to men, I may add a passage in which he speaks of them as forming the nucleus or starting-point from which was to develope a whole body or series of men charged with the same function. It occurs in a very curious comment upon our Lord's words to the Apostles whom He was sending forth, "The harvest truly is plenteous, but the labourers are few."

"The Lord," says S. Hilary, "pities the people, vexed by the prevailing violence of the unclean spirit, and sick under the burden of the Law, because He saw that they had as yet no shepherd, to restore to

[1] *Comment. in Matt.* xix. § 8.

them the protection of the Holy Ghost. For there was, indeed, a most plenteous fruit of that gift, but as yet not reaped by any. For His abundance exceeds the multitude of those who draw from it. How much soever He may be appropriated by all, He still has exuberant supplies of Himself to bestow. And because it would be useful that there should be many through whom He might be administered, He commands that the Lord of the harvest should be intreated to send forth many labourers into the harvest,—that God, that is, would provide plenty of reapers, to gather in the gift of the Holy Ghost which was preparing; for it is by means of prayer and supplication that this gift is poured out for us by God. And in order to shew that numbers of reapers were to be sent abroad into that harvest, issuing from these twelve Apostles first, He called them together and gave them power to cast out devils and to heal every infirmity. For by the force of this gift the disturber could be expelled and the infirm could be healed." [1]

It is not easy to follow the writer's thought; but he probably means that there were multitudes ready to bring forth the fruits of the Spirit, and abundance of power in the Spirit to bring forth fruit in them all, if only labourers enough could be found to convey the Holy Spirit to them. This was to be the work of the Twelve, and of their associates and successors, who would communicate it, "by means of prayer and supplication," as he says elsewhere, "in the sacrament of the Spirit," "after the waters of Baptism."

[1] *Comment. in Matt.* x. § 2.

It may be added that for S. Hilary, as for others, the bishop was the regular minister of Baptism. He speaks of the Ethiopian eunuch as "anticipating with such impatient and eager desire the sacrament of Baptism that in his eagerness for his own salvation he demanded of a deacon the services belonging to the Apostle's office."[1]

These passages may form a natural transition to the words in which S. Pacian, Bishop of Barcelona, whose long episcopate began before that of Hilary and ended later, argues against the Novatianist Sempronian, that the Apostolic powers of discipline are still the possession of the Church.

"Was this [binding and loosing] allowed only to the Apostles? Then to them only was it allowed to baptize, and to give the Holy Ghost, and to cleanse the sins of the Gentiles: for none but the Apostles were bidden to do any of this. But if in one and the same passage are given at once the loosing of bonds and the power of the sacrament, then either the whole has come down to us from the Apostles, whose exercise of the power was a precedent for us (*ex apostolorum forma et potestate*), or else the second of these things has no more been permitted by our charter than the first. . . . If, therefore, the power both of the Laver and of the Chrism, which are greater, and far greater, spiritual gifts, has descended from them to the bishops, then the right of binding and loosing also came along with it."[2]

It will be observed that the "power of the Laver"

[1] *Tract. in Psalm.* lxvii. § 33. [2] *Epist.* i. 6.

is disjoined from that "of the Chrism" by S. Pacian's "both" and "and" (*et lauacri et chrismatis*); that they are described as constituting distinct "spiritual gifts" (*charismata*), each of which far exceeds in value the exercise of discipline; and that the two stand over against "giving the Holy Ghost" and "cleansing the sins of the Gentiles" in inverted order. At the same time both are included under the head of "the sacrament;" and "to baptize" appears to suggest the "giving of the Spirit" first as forming part of it, and then as something distinct from it, so that the writer returns to it, and in order to give a clear notion of the value of *baptizare* by itself, adds *et gentium peccata purgare.*

In another letter, Pacian makes the reception of the Spirit a part of the baptismal regeneration. The Novatianist defines the Church to be "the people born again of water and the Holy Ghost;" to which the bishop replies:—

"Well, then; who has shut up the fountain of God? who has carried off the Spirit? Nay, with us is living water, even that which springs from Christ; you, separated as you are from the perpetual fountain, by what means are you begotten? the Holy Ghost, also, has not departed from the original Mother; by what means has He arrived at you? unless, perchance, He has followed a man who picks a quarrel, deserting all these many bishops, and not content with His consecrated home, has become enamoured of the broken cistern of a counterfeit fountain. Whence has your laity the Spirit, not being sealed by an anointed

priest? whence the water, having departed from the source? whence the making new (*innouationem*), having thrown away the cradle which peace, the attendant of the bridechamber, watches over?"[1]

In this passage, though Baptism and Unction represent for S. Pacian the birth of water and of the Spirit respectively, yet the baptismal water is not merely water; it is "living water" and it "springs from Christ." It has its own spiritual potency to convey, but that potency is not the gift of the Holy Ghost. *Neither* the living water, *nor* the Holy Ghost, are lacking to the Church; S. Pacian's *quoque* forbids us to identify them. There is a separate act, subsequent to the washing, on which the bestowal of the Holy Ghost depends,—the "sealing by an anointed priest."[2] Yet the two things form inseparably part of one and the same regenerating sacrament.

There is extant an interesting sermon of S. Pacian's on the sacrament of Baptism, in which the same ideas are similarly, but yet more clearly, expressed:—

"From this marriage is born the Christian people, the Spirit of the Lord coming down from above; and the heavenly seed being cast upon the substance of our souls, and forthwith blended with it, we grow to the inward parts of our Mother, and being produced from her womb are quickened into life in Christ.

[1] *Epist.* iii. 3.

[2] It seems clear that the Novatianists with whom Pacian had to deal practised the rite of Unction. The clause would lose all its force, neither would it run parallel with the following clauses, if it were taken to mean that they made no attempt to seal at all. S. Pacian's point is that these who professed to seal them were not "anointed priests."

Whence the Apostle, 'The first Adam was made a living soul; the last Adam was made a quickening Spirit.' This is the way that Christ begets children in the Church by His priests,—as the same Apostle says, 'I have begotten you to Christ.' And thus the seed of Christ, that is, the Spirit of God, sets in motion the new man in his mother's womb, brings him to birth at the font, and produces him by the hands of the priest,—faith, however, being attendant of the bridechamber. For a man will not be held to have been engrafted into the Church without having believed, nor begotten of Christ without having himself received the Spirit. We must believe, therefore, that it is possible for us to be born. For so Philip says, 'If thou believest, thou canst.' Christ must be received, in order that He may beget; because the Apostle John says thus, 'As many as received Him, to them gave He power to become the sons of God.' But these things cannot be otherwise fulfilled, except by the sacrament of the Laver and of the Chrism and of the Bishop. For by the Laver sins are purged; by the Chrism the Holy Ghost is poured upon us; and both these we gain by the hand and mouth of the Bishop; and thus the whole man is born again and made new in Christ."[1]

It would be difficult to express more clearly the belief that Baptism, and Unction, and presumably the Laying on of Hands, are component parts of a single whole, while each part has its own peculiar blessing to convey. The object of the sacrament of Baptism

[1] *Serm. de Baptismo* § 6.

is to regenerate men and make them sons of God. This, according to S. Pacian's teaching, they cannot be till they have received the Spirit. But the Spirit is not given by the Laver, of which the function is to wash away sins; it is given by the Chrism, together with the hand and mouth of the bishop. When that has been received, Baptism is complete, and the man regenerate.

S. Zeno, Bishop of Verona, was contemporary with Pacian and with Hilary. There is preserved a series of little allocutions of his, addressed to those who were approaching the font, in which he tells them what they are about to receive.

Circumcision, he says on one such occasion, was a Divine mark indeed, but conveyed no grace to the receiver: the case is far otherwise with Christian Baptism:—

"In this sacrament we are registered not with a mark (*signaculo*) of the Holy Spirit, but with His very seal (*signo*)."[1]

On another such occasion, he cries, in reference to the stripping of the candidate for Baptism:—

"Cast away then consistently and faithfully that old man of yours, with his filthy rags, for you shall soon step forth all new, all clothed in white, all rich with the gift of the Holy Ghost."[2]

But the sacrament which should thus endow them consisted of more than the baptismal washing. It included also the mystical counterparts of those actions which followed upon the use of the bath in ordinary life.

[1] *Tract.* i. 13. [2] *Ibid.* ii. 31.

"Make haste, make haste, brethren, to so good a bath. Living water, tempered by the Holy Ghost and most pleasant fire, even now invites you with its delightful murmur. Even now the bathing-man awaits you, ready girt up, to furnish you with what you need for anointing, and what you need for wiping."[1]

Of course the *balneator* is the bishop himself. He does not appear to dip the candidates with his own hands, but stands by, to administer the subsequent rites. It can hardly be doubted that the "wiping" (*tersus*) indicates a separate act from the washing and the anointing, which cannot well be anything but the Laying on of Hands.

The exceedingly close connexion of the gift with Baptism is seen also in one of S. Zeno's little Easter sermons:—

"We must understand the springtime to be the sacred font, out of whose rich bed, begotten not by the western wind but by the Holy Ghost, and breathing Divine fragrance in their happy faith, each with a different gift (*charismate*) but all with one natal origin, are brought forth the bright flowers of the Church, our beloved 'Infantes.'"[2]

But another Easter sermon, couched in the same strain, shews us that not only Confirmation, but (as was generally the custom) the First Communion also was administered to the "Infantes:"—

[1] *Tract.* ii. 35. The Ballerini aptly quote from Apul. *Metam.* i. p. 49, the words, *Ilico lauacro trado; quod unctui, quod tersui ipse praeministro.*

[2] *Ibid.* ii. 44.

"To-day, for our 'Competentes' (the highest class of candidates for Baptism) ends the winter of their sins. To-day they shall rejoice in the oil mingled with perfumes. Them also the smile of spring is about to bring out into varied flowers with varied gifts (*charismate*), when, having had the healthful water poured on them, and rejoicing in the harvest of a cloudless summer, they shall have begun to eat the new bread; nor shall they have to wait, either, for the new wine of the autumn, with which being filled and intoxicated they will glow with the blissful warmth of the Holy Ghost." [1]

It appears as if S. Zeno meant us to think of the gift of the Spirit and the rites which convey it, when he speaks of the "harvest of a cloudless summer." At any rate, the sacred Unction is for him a prominent feature in Baptism, following after the washing which ends the "winter of sins." There is another passage in his works where he interprets the "oil" of Psalm xxiii. to "signify the gift of the Holy Ghost." [2]

The great Ambrose of Milan was a contemporary, though a younger contemporary, of Zeno. Doubts have been freely expressed regarding the authorship of the two books included among his works under the titles of *De Mysteriis* and *De Sacramentis*—the principal reason for such doubt being the pronounced character of the sacramental doctrine contained in them, especially on the subject of the Eucharist.

[1] *Tract.* ii. 53. Sometimes a different punctuation of the earlier clauses of the paragraph is adopted.

[2] *Ibid.* ii. 14.

Modern Protestant scholars, however, have not felt bound, like earlier ones, to deny their genuineness; and assuredly the Eucharistic doctrine enunciated in them is not such as would have satisfied a divine of the Middle Ages. If Ambrose, like others of his time, speaks strongly of a "change" effected by consecration in the Eucharistic elements, he appears also, like S. Cyril of Jerusalem, S. Gregory of Nyssa, and others, to imply something of the same kind with regard to the baptismal water. Neither need the close similarity of the two works compel us, while accepting the earlier, to reject the later. All readers of the Fathers know how boldly they repeat themselves in almost identical words. This is especially true of their spoken discourses; and both the works which I have named consist of instructions orally addressed to the newly baptized at Easter-tide, expounding the ceremonies which they had undergone. Having described in mystical language the actual Baptism and its preliminary rites, S. Ambrose says:—

"After this you went up to the bishop (*sacerdotem*). Consider what followed. Was it not that of which David speaks, 'Like the ointment upon the head, which ran down unto the beard, even unto Aaron's beard'? This is the ointment of which Solomon also says, 'Thy name is as ointment poured forth; therefore the virgins love Thee.' . . . How many renewed souls have this day come to love Thee, O Lord Jesu, saying, 'Draw us after Thee; we run after the odour of Thy garments,' in order to breathe the odour of the Resurrection! The reason why this is done, you may

understand, is because 'the eyes of the wise are in his head.' It flows down to the beard, because it signifies the grace of the prime of life;—to Aaron's beard, that you may be made a chosen generation, sacerdotal, precious; for we all are anointed with spiritual grace unto the kingdom of God and unto the priesthood."[1]

Then, after describing the washing of the feet, which formed part of the baptismal ceremonies of the time at Milan, though not at Rome, and the investing in white raiment, S. Ambrose continues the mystical interpretation of the Song of Solomon which he had already begun; and, quoting words of the Bride which evince "an eagerness to penetrate to inner mysteries," he says:—

"Wherefore the Lord Jesus Himself also, being invited by such zealous love, and by the beauty of comeliness and grace, because there remains no defilement of sins in those who are now washed, says to the Church, 'Place Me as a seal upon thy heart, as a signet upon thine arm.' That is to say, 'Thou art comely, My beloved; thou art all fair, thou lackest nothing;'—now, 'place Me as a seal upon thy heart, in order that thy faith may gleam with the completeness of the sacrament (*pleno fulgeat sacramento*). Let thy works also shine and display the image of God, according to Whose image thou hast been made. Let thy love be undiminished by any persecution, incapable of being quenched by many waters, or drowned by the floods.' Remember, therefore, that

[1] *De Myst.* vi. § 29, 30.

you have received the spiritual seal, the Spirit of wisdom and understanding, the Spirit of counsel and might, the Spirit of knowledge and godliness, the Spirit of holy fear; and keep what you have received. God the Father has sealed you; Christ the Lord has confirmed you; and given the earnest of the Spirit in your hearts, as you have learned by the lesson from the Apostle. Rich with these insignia, the people that have been washed proceed to the altar of Christ." [1]

The whole concludes, after an instruction on the Eucharist, with the words:—

"Wherefore, having obtained all, let us know that we are regenerate; nor let us say, 'How are we regenerate?' . . . If the Holy Ghost coming upon the Virgin wrought the conception of Christ and performed the office of generation, it is not to be doubted that coming upon the font, or upon those on whom Baptism is conferred (*qui baptismum consequuntur*), He works the truth of regeneration." [2]

It must be owned that the meaning of the great prelate is not so clear to us as it no doubt was to those who first heard him. Scholars are not even agreed whether the second passage which I have quoted refers to the same act as the first, or to another,—whether the "Seal" is to be identified with the "Ointment upon the head," or not. If we had only the *De Mysteriis* to judge by, it would be the simplest thing to identify the two. S. Ambrose seems, for the time, to be following not so much the course of the baptismal service, as that of the Song of Solomon

[1] *De Myst.* vii. § 41, foll. [2] *Ibid* ix. § 59.

which brings him back to the mention of the washing away of sins, and thence to that of the Seal, which might well be the accompanying Unction again. But when we turn to the parallel account in the *De Sacramentis* (which, even if not composed by S. Ambrose, is at any rate an adaptation of the former work by an almost contemporary hand), it becomes clear that the Seal was not, in S. Ambrose's language, and in that of those who were near him, the Ointment upon the head. What else it was, is matter for conjecture rather than for certainty. Most people suppose that it was the special Unction of the forehead. If, however, we may assume that the order of things at Milan under Ambrose was the same as that at Rome a very little later under Innocent, then, in all probability, the Seal included both Unction of the forehead and Imposition of Hands in one.

The parallel passages in the *De Sacramentis* run as follows:—

"You dipped, therefore, in the water, and you came to the bishop. What did he say to you? 'Almighty God, the Father,' he said, 'Who hath regenerated thee with water and the Holy Ghost, and hath given unto thee the forgiveness of thy sins, Himself anoint thee unto eternal life.' See what you were anointed to:—'unto eternal life,' he says. Do not prefer this life to that life . . . Do not choose that to which you were not anointed, but choose that to which you were anointed, and prefer the eternal life to the temporal life."[1]

[1] *De Sacram.* ii. 24.

These words conclude one discourse. The next discourse begins with recurring to the Unction here mentioned:—

"Yesterday we were speaking about the font, the appearance of which is something like a sepulchre in shape,—in which, believing in the Father and the Son and the Holy Ghost, we are received, and plunged, and rise up,—that is our resurrection. But you receive the *μύρον*, that is, the ointment upon the head. Why upon the head? Because the sense of the wise is in his head, says Solomon. For wisdom without grace is a cold thing; but when wisdom receives grace, then her work begins to be perfect. This is called regeneration. What is regeneration? You find in the Acts of the Apostles that that verse which is said to be in the second Psalm, 'Thou art My Son; this day have I begotten Thee,' appears to refer to the Resurrection. . . . So also it is in Baptism. . . . As that Resurrection was a regeneration, so this resurrection is a regeneration."[1]

Here follows the description of the washing of the feet, and then the writer pursues:—

"Then follows the spiritual Seal which you have heard read about to-day: because after the font it remains for the perfecting to be done (*post fontem superest ut perfectio fiat*), when, in response to the bishop's invocation, the Holy Ghost is poured upon you,—the Spirit of wisdom and understanding, the Spirit of counsel and might, the Spirit of knowledge and godliness, the Spirit of holy fear,—seven powers,

[1] *De Sacram.* iii. § 1, 2.

as it were, of the Spirit. And indeed all powers belong to the Spirit; but these are, so to speak, the cardinal powers, the principal ones. . . . These are the seven powers conferred when you are sealed. For as the Apostle says, the wisdom of our God is 'manifold;' and as the wisdom of God is manifold, so is the Holy Ghost manifold, Who possesses diverse and varied powers. . . . After this, what follows? You have to go to the altar."[1]

We find, then, that, besides various suggestive ceremonies, S. Ambrose (assuming him to be the author of both books) recognised in Holy Baptism three grace-giving rites. The first, Baptism proper, conveyed the forgiveness of sins, and the resurrection to a new life. The second, Unction upon the head, consecrated the newly cleansed to royalty and priesthood, and "anointed him to eternal life." It was also regarded as symbolizing,—perhaps, in some way, conveying,—the attractiveness of Christian graces, a thought which S. Austin may have derived from the bishop who baptized him. To the third, which corresponds to S. Zeno's *tersus* and to S. Pacian's *sacramentum antistitis*, and which in all probability consisted of the Laying on of Hands, together with Unction of the forehead, and certainly with invocation of the Holy Ghost, S. Ambrose ascribed a higher value. While the Unction was so closely connected with the Laver as to be almost lost in it,—so that, after dwelling upon it at length, S. Ambrose proceeds with *post fontem superest*, as if he had spoken of

[1] *De Sacram.* iii. § 8, foll.

nothing but the font,—the third rite was to him the "Seal," and "Perfecting," and the "completeness of the sacrament." By means of it were given the sevenfold powers of the Spirit, and the earnest of the Spirit in the heart; and the effect was to make faith gleam, and works shine, and the image of God appear, and love gain strength to endure all persecution. Yet all these things were parts of Baptism in a wider usage of the word; and although the baptismal washing, even before the Unction, could be said to confer regeneration, in the sense of a resurrection after the dying to sin, yet it looks as if S. Ambrose, to judge by the closing words of the *De Mysteriis*, included the descent of the Holy Ghost upon the baptized within his conception of the new birth.

S. Ambrose does not speak very frequently elsewhere of the component elements of Baptism. But in one Epistle, to a man who had been converted in sickness and was recovering, he speaks of the marvels that were in store for him when he should advance to fuller faith and to the use of the sacraments.

"These beginnings of faith are not the same as the mysteries and sacraments of riper age; for 'eye hath not seen, nor ear heard, neither have entered into the heart of man, the things which God hath prepared for them that love Him,' as the Scripture has said. These are not those things which were announced concerning the glory that shall be, by the prophets to whom it was revealed, and which were preached by the saints 'with the Holy Ghost sent down from heaven, into Whom (*in quem*) the angels

also desire to look,' as the Apostle Peter says. These are not the things in which the redemption of the world is contained, the remission of sins, the distribution of graces, the participation of sacraments." [1]

As soon as Bellicius has received these things, he will marvel, Ambrose assures him, at the privileges bestowed in the Holy Communion. No one who has followed our investigation thus far will hesitate to agree with the Benedictine editors, when they note that by these things "in which is contained the redemption of the world," S. Ambrose "appears to indicate the sacraments of Baptism, Confirmation, and the Eucharist."

A second letter to Bellicius applies to his case the miracle of the man born blind, whom our Lord touched, and sent to Siloam:—

"He touched him, like sunshine, and poured light into him: He filled him, like the bishop (*sacerdos*), in a figure of Baptism, with the mysteries of spiritual grace. He spat, that you might observe that the inward parts of Christ are light. And truly sight is given to him who is cleansed by the inward things of Christ. His spittle washes; His word washes,—as you read, 'Now ye are clean through the word which I have spoken unto you.' His making clay and anointing the eyes of the blind man, what does it mean, but that you should understand that He Who restored the man to health by anointing him with clay was the same Who fashioned man of the clay; and that this flesh of clay of ours, by means of the

[1] *Epist.* lxxix. § 4.

sacraments of Baptism, receives the light of eternal life."[1]

What has been said regarding a similar expression of S. Hilary's applies here also. The phrase "sacraments of Baptism" must not be pressed to prove that S. Ambrose regarded Confirmation (which is probably alluded to in the "anointing") as a sacrament in the modern sense. He may perhaps have included in the term the washing of the feet and other rites of a purely symbolical nature. But it shews that Baptism meant to him more than the single act of washing, and that he believed the benefit of spiritual sight to be conveyed by the whole series of acts, and not by the first alone.

S. Gaudentius, Bishop of Brescia, was the most distinguished of the younger prelates whom Ambrose gathered round him. He was consecrated by S. Ambrose. He was a friend and correspondent of S. Chrysostom, whom he had visited at Antioch, while both were only presbyters. To him Rufinus dedicated one of his translations (for no other Gaudentius suits the description), in terms of the highest respect for his accomplishments, as well as for his graces. He was still alive in the year 406, and probably for several years after.

One of his extant sermons is on the first miracle of our Lord. By a not uncommon confusion of thought, he fails to observe the difference between the symbolism of water when used for washing and of water when used for drinking. The change of

[1] *Epist.* lxxx. § 5, 6.

the water into wine suggests to him the gift of the Spirit in Baptism. Christ, he says mystically, would not turn the water into wine before the right moment was come—

"Until, after His own Resurrection, He should pass over to the Gentiles, to give them Himself as the bread of life, and, by means of the water of Baptism, to make them drink the cup of the Holy Spirit." [1]

A little further on :—

"The blessed Apostles, fulfilling the duty of faithful servants, filled the waterpots of the believing nations with the water of reverend Baptism, and the Lord Jesus by His unseen power turned this water into wine, so that those who were baptized by them immediately testified the savour of the Divine Spirit working in them by the sudden grace of tongues." [2]

Later on, he gives a different turn to his interpretation of the water :—

"Therefore, after that the Lord Jesus has made wine in us out of water, in order to shew, as the Apostle says, the riches of His glory towards the vessels of mercy, and has seasoned all the baptized with the savour of the Holy Ghost, turning the water of the letter of the law in the hearts of believers into spiritual wisdom, then . . . the Apostles draw from the waterpots of the baptized Gentiles both the spiritual savour and the spiritual grace of Gospel force—the savour consisting in faith, the grace of

[1] *Serm.* ix. 284. [2] *Ibid.* 288.

colour in work; the one of which is perceived by the nostril, the other by the eye."[1]

This cannot be called a perspicuous statement of baptismal doctrine, but it may be gathered that S. Gaudentius felt that Baptism was not only an external application of water, but also the means of conveying an internal draught of the Spirit, productive, even now, of faith and good works, and, in old days, of miraculous utterance. As, however, we nowhere read in the New Testament of these miraculous utterances being vouchsafed in Baptism unaccompanied by the Laying on of Hands, we cannot suppose that S. Gaudentius meant to teach that the sacramental water *alone* brought all these benefits, but that the water stands for the whole baptismal sacrament. It is, therefore, not surprising that in another sermon he should specially connect the "gift of grace" with Unction:—

"All we, therefore, to whom, being gathered from among sinners, it has been vouchsafed to drink the faith of Christ, being made partakers of the altar and having obtained the gift of grace (*donum charismatis*), may well praise the things which God bestows with the voice of exultation and confession, saying, 'Thou hast prepared a table before me against them that trouble me; Thou hast anointed my head with oil.'"[2]

Rufinus, who has already been mentioned as an admirer of Gaudentius, belonged by Baptism to the distinguished Church of Aquileia, in which also his

[1] *Serm.* 291. [2] *Ibid.* xix. 367.

last years were spent. His remarks upon the title of the twenty-sixth Psalm—*priusquam liniretur*—resembling those of S. Austin, which I have already quoted,[1] shew that the traditional doctrine of Aquileia was not different from that of Milan, and of Verona, and of Brescia.

"The faithful," he says, "are twice anointed (*inunguntur*); the first time, in their Baptism, when they receive the pledge of the Spirit (*in baptismo, quando accipiunt pignus Spiritus*), which anointing is a foreshowing, and as it were an earnest, of the anointing that is to be; and the second, after this life is ended."[2]

The Anointing is "in Baptism," but its grace is distinct and peculiar to itself.

It is a slight departure from chronological order, but it has the advantage of maintaining local connexion, to place next the names of two of the most celebrated preachers of the fifth century—S. Peter Chrysologus, Bishop of Ravenna, who died A.D. 454, and S. Maximus, Bishop of Turin, who died a few years later.

Preaching on the feast of the Epiphany, that is, of Christ's Baptism, Peter says:—

"To-day the Holy Ghost floats over the waters in the form of a dove, in order that, as the dove of Noe had announced the departure of the world's deluge, so by that sign it might be known that the world's long shipwreck was at an end,—yet not, like that former dove, to carry a twig of the olive, but He

[1] See p. 87.

[2] *Comment. in Psalm.* xxvi. *tit.*

pours the entire fatness of the chrism upon the head of the new Parent, to fulfil that which the prophet foretold, 'Therefore God, even Thy God, hath anointed Thee with the oil of gladness above Thy fellows.'"[1]

The allusiveness of this passage becomes clearer on comparing another sermon, in which S. Peter expounds the Parable of the Unjust Steward and his debtors:—

"The Jew owed the oil, which had been lent him under the bond of the Law to anoint kings, prophets, and priests for a type of the Christian Chrism, until he should come to that Chief of kings and prophets and priests, to Whom was to be paid up, and on Whom was to be poured, the entire hundredfold plenitude of the chrism."[2]

This is, perhaps, the earliest Western recognition that by the baptismal Unction the Christian is made prophet, as well as priest and king.

S. Maximus gives us three sermons (the genuineness of which, however, is doubtful) of the same kind as those of S. Ambrose above quoted, in which he expounds the successive rites of Baptism.

"Hitherto we have spoken of the mysteries which are celebrated either before the sacrament of Baptism, or in the Baptism itself. Now we are to treat of those which, by a holy institution, are performed as a complement upon those who have already been baptized (*in iam baptizatis complentur*). For Baptism having been accomplished, we pour over your head the Chrism, that is, the oil of sanctification

[1] *Serm.* clx. [2] *Serm.* cxxvi.

(consecration), by which is signified that the Lord bestows upon the baptized the royal and the priestly dignity. For in the Old Testament, those who were chosen to the priesthood or the kingship were anointed with holy oil and the unction of the head; the one received from God power to reign, the other to offer sacrifices:—as we read that holy David and the other kings were anointed by the prophets, and were changed by the oil of sanctification from private persons into kings:—as we read also that holy Aaron was anointed by Moses, and was consecrated by the holy oil from a layman into a priest of God, whence also we sing in the Psalm, 'Like the ointment upon the head, that ran down unto the beard, even unto Aaron's beard.' But that oil in the Old Testament conferred a temporal kingship, a temporal priesthood; for in it, life and its ministry was ended by the course of a few years. But *this* Chrism, that is, this Unction which has been put on you, has conferred the dignity of that priesthood, which, when once it has been conferred, is never to be closed. What we have said is marvellous, no doubt, that you, by that Chrism, have obtained the kingdom and priesthood of the future glory; but it is not I,—it is the Apostle Peter,—nay, through Peter, Christ Himself declares that this dignity has been conferred upon you. For he speaks thus to the faithful, that is, to those who have been washed with Baptism and consecrated with Chrism, 'Ye are a royal and priestly race.'"[1]

Shortly after, Maximus adds this warning:—

[1] *Tract.* iii.

"Consider, then, the honour which you have obtained in this mystery, and beware lest you, who, after your sins, have through Baptism been made sons of the kingdom, by sinning again (which God forbid) should choose to be made sons of hell."

From the manner in which the warning comes in, Maximus appears to include the consecrating Unction under the general title of that Baptism which makes men sons of the kingdom. At any rate, the words quoted immediately before shew that he does not consider a man to deserve to be reckoned among "the faithful" without it. He does not, however, enter upon the actual nature of the gift given in Unction, contenting himself with the mention of the rights which it confers. It is, however, a far more remarkable point that in his account of Holy Baptism he stops short at the Unction of the head, appearing thereby to treat the Imposition of Hands, or the "Seal" of S. Ambrose (which he cannot but have known), as normally a distinct thing. In this respect Maximus—if, indeed, Maximus is the author—stands alone till late in the eighth century.

Returning back some eighty or ninety years, to a contemporary of Rufinus, we find a few notes on the subject under discussion in the commentaries of the "Ambrosian" Hilary. This Hilary wrote during the pontificate of Damasus (366–384), and from the language which he uses concerning him, it is natural to suppose that he belonged to the Roman Church. Bishop Lightfoot, while distinguishing him from the Roman deacon of that name who became

henchman to Lucifer of Cagliari, speaks of him as "the Roman Hilary."[1]

The first of these notes teaches that the Holy Spirit is given in Baptism; it teaches also, what we shall soon meet with again in a greater Roman author, that the gift so given may be forfeited and yet recovered.

"Although they [the Corinthians] had already been baptized, and had received the Holy Ghost, yet, because after Baptism they had returned directly to the old man which they had renounced, they are called carnal. For the Holy Ghost only remains in the man into whom He has poured Himself, on condition that the man remains true to his regeneration (*in proposito regenerationis*); otherwise, He departs; yet in such a manner that if the man reforms himself, He returns to him. For He is ever ready for that which is good, and loves penitence."[2]

Hilary had no better reason for thinking that the Spirit had departed from the Corinthians, than Irenaeus had for thinking that they had never received Him. S. Paul's language expressly contradicts both theories. But he is so far more in agreement with the Epistle on which he is commenting, that he recognises that they had once received the gift. It is not easy to determine whether the "and" between the first two verbs is one of identity or of differentiation,—whether to Hilary the receiving of the Holy Ghost expresses the inner contents of Baptism, or whether it was something additional, though connected. Either

[1] *Philippians* p. 101, ed. 2.

[2] On 1 Cor. iii. 1.

would be in accordance with ancient teaching, though the word "Baptism" would stand for different actions in the two cases. But commenting on a later verse, Hilary shews that by Baptism he understood two blessings to be conveyed,—forgiveness and the Holy Ghost,—and that the latter (at any rate at the time spoken of) was ordinarily given by Imposition of Hands, which thus forms a part of Baptism. When Baptism is then spoken of separately, the remission of sins falls to its share in the work of grace.

"To 'plant' is to preach the Gospel and attract to the faith; to 'water' is to baptize with the customary words; but to forgive sins, and to bestow the Spirit, belongs to God alone. If it is God, therefore, Who gives the saving effect, no glory belongs to man in the matter. For we know that both the Holy Ghost has been given by God without the Imposition of the Hand, and that one not baptized has obtained the remission of sins. Was not that man invisibly baptized, when he obtained the gift of Baptism?"[1]

If, as is most probable, Hilary refers to the case of Cornelius, then the Holy Ghost is "the gift of Baptism." Yet the Holy Ghost was not, in Hilary's view, the gift of Baptism proper. Even if this could not be clearly gathered from the comment just considered, he speaks of the gift elsewhere as a blessing subsequent to Baptism. He describes the Ephesians as "having the seal of redemption and of the future inheritance, even the Holy Ghost given after Baptism (*datum post baptismum*)."[2]

[1] On verse 6. [2] On Eph. i. 13.

The comment of the contemporary S. Jerome upon the same passage of the Epistle to the Ephesians shews that he regarded the gift of the Spirit as an essential part of regeneration, if not actually constituting it. S. Jerome was at one time confidential secretary to Damasus, Bishop of Rome, already named; and although he was brought into close contact with all the great theological movements of his time, he represents most completely the Roman Church of his day, and the school to which Hilary belonged.

"He who has heard the word of the truth, and has believed in it, is sealed with the Holy Spirit of promise. For there are many who have heard, and because they remain without believing have by no means obtained the seal of the Holy Spirit. . . . It is the seal of God; so that, as the first man was created after the image and similitude of God, so in the second re-generation, whosoever has obtained the Holy Ghost, is sealed (*signetur, i.e.* stamped) by Him, and receives the outline of his Creator."[1]

Perhaps no other Western Father comes so near as S. Jerome to saying that this inestimable gift is conveyed by the baptismal washing. In his youthful dialogue directed against the over-orthodox schism of the Luciferians, he thus developes with great force the argument of S. Cyprian (though for an opposite purpose) against those who would maintain the validity of heretical Baptism while denying to heretics the power of transmitting the Holy Ghost.

"I," says the follower of Lucifer, "receive the

[1] *Comment. in Eph.* i. 13 (vol. iv. p. 332, Martianay).

repentant layman by Imposition of the Hand and invocation of the Holy Ghost, knowing that heretics cannot possibly confer the Holy Ghost."

To which the orthodox disputant replies :—

"When a man, baptized in the Father and the Son and the Holy Ghost, becomes a temple of the Lord,—when the old fabric is broken up and a new fane of the Trinity is built,—how can you say that among the Arians there can be forgiveness of sins, without the coming of the Holy Ghost? How is a soul purified from its old defilements, which has not the Holy Ghost? Water does not wash the soul; it has first to be itself washed by the Spirit, in order that it may spiritually wash others. 'The Spirit of the Lord,' says Moses, 'moved upon the face of the waters.' From which it is clear that there is no Baptism without the Holy Spirit. The Jewish pool of Bethsaida could not heal the bodily limbs that were maimed, except by the coming of an angel; and you bring me a soul washed clean by mere water, as if out of a bath! Our Lord Jesus Christ Himself, Who, instead of being cleansed by the washing, rather by His washing cleansed all waters, directly He raised His head from the stream, received the Holy Ghost,—not because He was ever without the Holy Ghost, for He was born in flesh by the Holy Ghost, but in order that we might be shewn that that is true Baptism to which the Holy Ghost comes (*quo Spiritus sanctus adueniat*). Therefore if the Arian cannot give the Holy Ghost, he cannot even baptize, because it is no Baptism of the Church without the Holy Ghost. But

you, when you receive one who has been baptized by him, and then invoke the Holy Ghost, ought rather either to baptize him, because without the Holy Ghost he could not have been baptized; or if he has been baptized in the Spirit, leave off invoking upon him the Spirit, Whom he received at the time of his Baptism (*tunc quum baptizaretur*)."[1]

This passage discloses that the writer had hardly felt much difference between the presence and operation of the Holy Ghost in the remission of sins and that further gift which is described as His indwelling. It must be acknowledged that he treats the "coming" of the Holy Ghost almost as if it were the invisible grace corresponding to the outward act of Baptism. The Holy Ghost moves over the waters; He cleanses them; He "comes to" the Baptism, which without Him would be no Baptism; the forgiveness of sins depends upon "having" Him. All this is true; but Jerome seems to teach that it amounts to that "conferring" of the Holy Ghost, which his opponent connects with the Imposition of the Hand and Invocation. Jerome might have learned better from the great African divine whose language he was using. Yet even Jerome's words leave room to think that in his opinion, although Baptism without the gift would be a mere form, yet the gift rather accompanied Baptism than was actually conveyed by it. Our Lord, he says, received the Holy Ghost directly after Baptism, not exactly by it; and he makes that Baptism a pattern for ours. When he says that if

[1] *Adv. Lucifer.* (vol. iv. p. 292).

the Arian cannot give the Holy Ghost, he "cannot even baptize" (*ne baptizare quidem potest*), he appears to feel some distinction between the two things, making Baptism a step towards the other. His statement that that alone is true Baptism "to which the Holy Ghost comes" is not so strong as that of the *De Rebaptismate*, that "only that Baptism can avail in which the Holy Ghost also may be (*inesse*);" yet the author of that treatise by no means ascribes the gift to the application of the sacramental water. Jerome argues that if the Arian could convey any spiritual benefit at all, the person baptized by him ought not, on his reception into the Church, to be confirmed, inasmuch as he must have received the Spirit "at the time of his Baptism;" but he is speaking of persons baptized by Arian bishops, and therefore confirmed by them also "at the time of their Baptism." It was Jerome's contention that all their episcopal acts, including Ordinations, were unaffected by their heresy, and therefore that that Confirmation was valid, as well as the Baptism of which it formed part.

What S. Jerome here says, therefore, about the gift of the Spirit in Baptism does not amount to much more than what we have already seen expressed by others. And in a subsequent passage of the same dialogue, he distinctly allows that as a rule the gift of the Spirit was only given by the episcopal act of Confirmation, although he says that there is no reason to think this a law of necessity, but rather a matter of order and propriety.

"Do you not know," urges the Luciferian, "that this is the custom of the Churches, that hands should afterwards be laid upon the baptized, and the Holy Ghost thus invoked upon them? Do you demand where it is written? In the Acts of the Apostles. Even if there were not the authority of the Scripture to uphold the custom, the consent of the entire world to this view would have the force of a command. . . . So you perceive that we follow the usage of the Church, although it is admitted that the man has already been baptized before the Spirit is called upon."

The orthodox replies:—

"I do not deny that this is the usage of the Churches, that the bishop should make excursions to those who have been baptized a long way off in the smaller towns by presbyters and deacons, to lay his hand upon them for the invoking of the Holy Ghost. But . . . if the bishop lays on his hand, he lays it upon those who have been baptized in the right faith. . . . But how shall the Arian . . . receive from the Church the Holy Ghost, when as yet he has not even obtained the remission of his sins? The Holy Ghost does not take up His abode in any but a pure faith; nor is He made an indweller of a temple which has not true faith for its minister. If at this point you ask, why a man baptized in the Church does not receive the Holy Ghost except by the hands of the bishop, when we assert that He is bestowed in true Baptism (*quare in ecclesia baptizatus nisi per manus episcopi non accipiat Spiritum sanctum quem nos asserimus in uero baptismate tribui*), learn that we

traditionally derive the practice from the authoritative fact, that it was upon the Apostles that the Holy Ghost, after the Lord's Ascension, came down. And in many other passages we find that the same thing took place, more for the honouring of the bishop's office than by any law of necessity (*ad honorem potius sacerdotii quam ad legem necessitatis*). Otherwise, if the Holy Ghost only flows down at the bishop's imprecation, we must bewail those who having been baptized in their beds, or in villages, or in the more remote places, have fallen asleep before they were visited by the bishops. The safety of the Church depends upon the dignity of her chief priest; and if there be not some peculiar power given to him, surpassing that of all others, there will be as many schisms among the Churches as there are priests. So it comes about that neither the presbyter nor the deacon have the right to baptize, without the Chrism and the command of the bishop. And this, though only in case of necessity and compulsion, we are aware is frequently allowed also to laymen. For as a man receives, so can he also give."[1]

The dialogue from which these extracts come, took place—or was composed—at Antioch; and the name of the Luciferian, Helladius, would be suitable to an Oriental. If there had been any material difference of doctrine or practice between East and West upon the subject, it would probably have been

[1] *Adv. Lucifer.* vol. iv. pp. 294, 295. It would appear as if a sentence had dropped out before, 'And in many other passages,'—perhaps describing the Confirmation at Samaria.

mentioned by one or other of the disputants. Both are agreed that the Laying on of Hands after Baptism is an universal practice, derived from Apostolic times, and that it is the usual method of receiving the Holy Spirit. It would, indeed, seem as if S. Jerome restricted the practice to those who had been baptized without the presence of the bishop, and as if the Laying on of Hands were not one of the baptismal ceremonies when the bishop himself baptized. This, however, is not quite certainly his meaning; for he is taking the case which, in Catholic practice, most nearly resembled the case of baptized Arians admitted to Lucifer's communion by Imposition of Hands. But however that may be, he clearly acknowledges that in these cases the gift of the Holy Ghost is, as a rule, only given by the Laying on of Hands, although if the Laying on of Hands is unattainable for them, the Baptism which they have received is a sufficient channel for the grace. It must, at the same time, be observed, that that Baptism which they have received at the hands of presbyter or deacon, by which they obtained some "down-flow" of the Holy Ghost, is a Baptism which includes Unction, and, as it appears, Unction with chrism prepared by the bishop and applied at his bidding. But S. Jerome's defective apprehension of the difference between the baptismal operation of the Holy Spirit and the Confirmation gift brings him into a difficulty from which he suggests no means of escape. He affirms that the power of bestowing the gift rests with the bishop, and that the safety of the

Church depends upon the bishop's being endowed with powers which none share with him; and yet he supposes that the gift must be bestowed when presbyters and deacons baptize, because otherwise the persons baptized by them are to be bewailed, that is, are lost. A clearer view of the difference between the two modes of grace, such as he might have learned from S. Cyprian, or from S. Cyprian's opponent either, would have made the problem easier to solve.

That sometimes such a view was very near him is seen in another well-known passage, where, after the manner of the Greek Fathers, he describes the *profectus apostolicus*,—the progress by which the Apostles passed from a lesser to a greater fulness of the gift. The question propounded to him is, how the Lord could give the Holy Spirit on the night of His Resurrection, and yet the Holy Spirit only came seven weeks later.

"The solution of this question is very easy, if, following the teaching of the Apostle Paul (1 Cor. xii. 4), we recognise that there is a diversity of gifts (*gratias*) of the Holy Spirit. . . . On the first day of the Resurrection, therefore, they received a gift (*gratiam*) of the Holy Spirit, by which they could remit sins, and baptize, and make men sons of God, and impart the Spirit of adoption to believers. . . . But on the day of Pentecost, something larger was promised to them,—that they should be baptized with the Holy Ghost, and be endued with power from on high, by which they should preach the Gospel of

Christ to all nations, . . . that they should have the working of miracles, and, as they were to preach to many nations, should receive divers kinds of tongues. . . . It is the Apostolic progress. . . . But I," adds S. Jerome, "assert boldly and with the utmost freedom of speech that from the moment when the Apostles first believed the Lord, they always had the Holy Ghost; and that they could not have wrought signs without a gift (*gratia*) of the Holy Ghost,—though according to measure and degree. Therefore the Saviour cried in the temple, saying, 'He that thirsteth, let him come unto Me, and drink. This spake He of the Spirit, Which they that believed on Him should afterwards receive;' and in the same place it adds, 'For the Spirit was not yet given, because that Jesus was not yet glorified;'—not because the Spirit was not yet, . . . but because He was in the Lord, and did not as yet abide fully in the Apostles."[1]

And in commenting upon the great prophecy of Joel, he shews a clear appreciation of the difference between receiving the Holy Spirit, and receiving any specific tokens of His presence:—

"Not every one who has received the Holy Ghost, will necessarily have also a spiritual gift (*gratiam spiritalem*); but he will obtain through the 'pouring out' of the Holy Ghost a diversity of gifts (*diuersas gratias*). Some will obtain prophecy, like the sons and daughters, who are of greater worth; some dreams, like the old men now well stricken in years;

[1] *Ad Hedib.* quaest. ix.

some visions, like the young men who have overcome the wicked one. But the servants and handmaidens, who still have the spirit of fear and not of love (because perfect love casteth out fear), will not have prophecy, or dreams, or visions; but being contented with the outpouring of the Holy Ghost, they will possess but the gift (*gratiam*) of faith and of salvation."[1]

It has already been seen that S. Jerome included Unction in his view of Baptism, even when administered by the second and third orders of the ministry. Another passage of his works will shew what value he attached to this Unction; and while it will give another indication of his sense of a progress in the possession of the Spirit, it will also shew that he agreed with his senior contemporary, the commentator Hilary, in considering the loss of the baptismal gift to be not an irreparable loss.

"First let us see how many kinds of 'Anointeds' there are. . . . In the Old Testament, the patriarchs are described as 'Anointeds' (Ps. cv. 14). . . . In Exodus also a priestly chrism is prepared, and afterwards the priests in Leviticus are recorded to have been anointed with it. There is also another ointment with which the kings were anointed to the kingdom. . . . There is a prophetic ointment, with which Elias is bidden to anoint Elisaeus prophet. And above all kinds of ointments is that spiritual ointment which is called the 'oil of gladness,' with which the Saviour is anointed, and addressed thus,

[1] Vol. iii. p. 1359.

'Therefore hath God, even Thy God, anointed Thee with the oil of gladness above Thy fellows.' The 'fellows' I take to be those to whom John also speaks, 'And ye have an Unction from the Holy One.' . . . And lest perchance those who have lost their baptismal Chrism (*chrisma baptismi*) should despair of recovering the Chrism, it is written in Leviticus, that when the leper, cast out of the camp, comes to the priest, and his leprosy is found to be cleansed, the priest should pour oil into his own left hand, and dipping his finger seven times in the oil should sprinkle it before the Lord, and should touch with the same oil the ear of him who had been a leper, and his right hand, and his right foot, and should pour what remains of the oil wholly upon his head; and when all these things are duly accomplished, that he should then offer a burnt offering for him, and the man should be called an anointed of God. I desire to say a thing; but I am afraid lest I should give occasion of falling to the careless;—it is that in the Holy Scriptures the same man is found to be frequently anointed. Thus David was thrice anointed. But we must not understand this to refer to the man who has sinned and is anointed again (for it is enough for the leper that after losing his first ointment he should be anointed a second time), but rather to him who advances day by day, and his Unction continually increases, and from the oil of the leper he passes to the oil of the people and of the holy nation, and from the oil of the people he comes to the oil of the priests, and from the priests he goes

on to the chrism of the high priest,—yes, and from the high priest to the king; from the king and the patriarchs he proceeds to the Christ, and is anointed with the oil of gladness, with which whosoever has been anointed is made one Spirit with God, and where the Father and the Son are, there he is also. But this is a rare thing, and the aspiration of believers."[1]

That the Spirit can be forfeited and recovered is implied again when the Luciferian, in the dialogue already quoted, describes in the following terms the discipline of penance, with which his interlocutor finds no fault:—

"The bishop (*sacerdos*) offers the layman's offering for him, lays his hand upon him as his subject (*imponit manum subiecto*), invokes the return of the Holy Spirit (*reditum sancti Spiritus inuocat*); and so, the prayers of the people having been bidden, he reconciles to the altar him who had been delivered unto Satan for the destruction of the flesh that the spirit might be saved."[2]

The teaching of S. Jerome on the subject of our inquiry may be summed up thus. He appears to have felt more markedly than others of his time the oneness of the various gifts given in Baptism considered as a whole, and, perhaps, the pre-eminence of the sacramental Washing amongst the rites which constituted it. While rightly perceiving that there are many degrees and diversities in the mode of the Holy Ghost's action upon men, it was his bent

[1] *Comment. in Abac.* iii. p. 1632. [2] *Adv. Lucif.* p. 291.

rather to minimise than to enhance the difference between them. He not only insists that the remission of sins and regeneration, which are the gifts of Baptism proper, come by "having" the Holy Ghost, but he also insists that still earlier good motions come from "having" Him. Thus, while the actual words which he uses are true, and such as any believer in the grace of the Holy Spirit must accept, he is driven to make as little as possible of those strong expressions of the Scriptures, which teach that in view of the Pentecostal gift, and in view of the same gift bestowed by the Laying on of Hands, believers before that date, or prior to that rite, could be said not to have received the Holy Ghost. It is, perhaps, of a piece with this tendency, that S. Jerome regards (in common with other Roman teachers of his time) the gift of the Spirit in Baptism as capable of being regained through penitence, if lost through heresy or other sin. Yet, in order rightly to appreciate his position, it must be remembered that he describes the blessing thus lost and regained not as *baptismi aqua,* but as *baptismi chrisma.* The passage in which the words occur is, no doubt, a mystical passage, and it is quite possible that the author did not intend them to mean the actual administration of the Chrism at the time of Baptism, but rather the inward unction of the Spirit accompanying the baptismal sacrament. But it is at least significant that when he speaks of this gift as lost and recovered, he by no means advocates a rebaptism of the penitent. The lost gift returns by the penitential Laying on of Hands and

invocation. Even to Jerome, therefore, the gift must have been, instinctively if not consciously, something superadded upon Baptism proper, rather than the grace of such Baptism itself. It tells in the same direction, that he admits that persons baptized by priests and deacons, although anointed with Chrism prepared by the bishop and at his bidding, are not reckoned to have obtained the Holy Ghost without having been brought to receive his Laying on of Hands,—unless, indeed, they should die without an opportunity of receiving it;—and this, although speculatively it might have been conceived of otherwise, Jerome considers to be practically necessary, because without it there would be no sufficient sanction for the episcopal authority, upon which, he says, the safety of the Church depends. At the same time, he appears to include even this deferred Laying on of Hands in "true Baptism," and does not regard it as an independent thing.[1]

The letters of early Roman bishops are always liable to suspicion, and we may safely reject those decrees of Melchiades, Silvester, Eusebius, and Damasus, which influenced the teaching and practice of the Middle Ages with regard to Confirmation, and

[1] His language about the Chrism, in the Commentary on Habakkuk above cited, must be borne in mind when we use his famous expression *sacerdotium laici, id est, baptisma* (*adv. Lucif.* p. 290). Jerome was not called upon to say whether a man could claim this *sacerdotium* on the ground of Baptism alone, for he appears not to have known that such baptisms could ever take place. He clearly (like others) regarded the *baptismi chrisma* as conveying it; but he preferred to regard Baptism as a single whole, rather than to resolve it into its several parts.

upon some of which even later authors have unwarily relied. But there are a few letters of Roman prelates of the fourth and fifth centuries, bearing upon the subject, which do not deserve to be treated as forgeries. They are, naturally, regulative in their intention, giving directions about the reception of heretics, the method and the minister of Confirmation, and the like; but incidentally they throw light upon the doctrinal value attached to the acts.

The first of these letters is one of Sirice, who succeeded on the death of Damasus (December, A.D. 384). The letter, indeed, announces the writer's succession, and replies to one which Himerius, Bishop of Tarragona, had written to Damasus. Sirice complains that, through the arbitrary self-will of his brother-bishops, there has arisen on some points connected with Baptism "a censurable and much-to-be-corrected confusion" (*improbabilis et emendanda confusio*),—an assertion which soon began to prove only too true with regard to the second part of that Sacrament, as the frequent decrees of Popes and Western Councils in the next two centuries testify. The special point which Sirice censures is that a Nicene Canon, and the injunctions based upon it "by my predecessor of revered memory, Liberius," had not been strictly observed, which directed that converts from Arianism should not be rebaptized, but should be attached to the Catholic Communion "by means of invocation of the sevenfold Spirit only, by Imposition of the bishop's Hand" (*per inuocationem solam septiformis Spiritus, episcopalis manus impositione*).

This custom, says Sirice, is observed throughout all the East and West. It is but a dispute about words when it is debated whether such an act is or is not Confirmation. The "sevenfold Spirit" is the Confirmation gift.[1]

A letter of Innocent I., who succeeded in A.D. 402, shews as plainly as that of Sirice that if the penitential Laying on of Hands at the reception of heretics was not actually Confirmation, at any rate it had precisely the same supposed spiritual value. It is a curious point, though beside our present purpose, that the Roman bishop adopts, in writing to the Bishop of Antioch, exactly the position of Lucifer with regard to the validity of Arian Baptism and the invalidity of Arian Orders, against which the Roman presbyter at Antioch had directed his keen ridicule some five and twenty years before.

"As for the Arians and other similar plagues, the fact that we adopt their lay people, when they turn to the Lord, under the symbol of penitence and sanctification of the Holy Ghost, through the Imposition of the Hand (*sub imagine paenitentiae ac sancti Spiritus sanctificatione per manus impositionem*), does not indicate that their clergy ought to be adopted with the dignity of the priesthood or of any ministerial rank. We only allow their Baptism to be valid, on the ground of its being performed in the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy

[1] The letter is quoted in a genuine epistle of Innocent I., as well as by Isidore of Seville, and is found in the collection of Dionysius Exiguus early in the sixth century.

Ghost, nor do we deem that they have the Holy Ghost from that Baptism and those mysteries (*ex illo baptismate illisque mysteriis*). When their founders departed from the Catholic faith, they lost the perfection of the Spirit, which they had received; nor can they give His fulness (which has its chief operation in giving Orders), which by the faithlessness of their impiety—I cannot call it faith—they have lost. How is it possible for us to consider their profane priests worthy of the honours of Christ, when their laymen are received, as I said, as incomplete (*imperfectos*), to gain the grace (or gift, *gratiam*) of the Holy Ghost with the symbol of penitence?"[1]

[1] *Epist.* xxiv. (*ad Alexandrum ep. Antioch.*) § 4. The letter is found in Dionysius. That no real distinction between the confirmatory and the penitential Laying on of Hands was seen is proved by S. Jerome's dialogue against the Luciferian, where it would have been exactly to the point to deny that there was any identity between the rite practised by the Luciferians (and others) in receiving heretics, and the rite practised by Catholic bishops in completion of baptisms bestowed by Catholic presbyters. The earliest attempt to distinguish between the two things—if the document is genuine—occurs in an epistle purporting to be by Vigilius, Bishop of Rome (A.D. 538), which says, of men who had received Arian Baptism "But their reconciliation does not take effect (*operatur*,—perhaps, in late Latin, 'is not effected') by means of that Imposition of the Hand which takes place through (*per*) invocation of the Holy Ghost, but by means of that Imposition whereby the fruit of penitence is acquired and the restoration of the Holy Communion is performed." But there is grave reason to discredit the document. It exists in more than one form, and has certainly been largely interpolated in the interests of the Roman see. It is alleged to be the same letter which was read aloud at the first Council of Braga (A.D. 561), addressed by the see of Rome to Profuturus, formerly Bishop of Braga. But, on the one hand, there is nothing to prove that the letter read there was written by Vigilius, or that Profuturus was contemporary with him; and, on the other hand, several ancient copies of our letter appear to be addressed *ad Eutherium* without mention of his see. The contents of the epistle,

S. Innocent is not content to ascribe the gift of the Holy Ghost to Baptism by itself; the expression, "from that Baptism and those mysteries," implies additional ceremonies attached to Baptism, and conveying the gift along with it. This is more directly stated in a more famous letter of his, in which he attempts to regulate the growing confusion which attended the administration of the baptismal sacraments.

"Concerning the sealing of 'Infantes,' it is manifest that it is not lawful to be done by any other than the bishop. For presbyters, although they are priests of the second order (*secundi sacerdotes*), yet have not the mitre of the high-priesthood (*pontificatus apicem*). That this high-priestly office (*pontificium*) belongs only to the bishops, either to seal, or to transmit the Comforter Spirit (*ut uel consignent, uel tradant*), is proved not only by Church usage, but also by that passage of the Acts of the Apostles, which asserts that both Peter and John were sent to transmit the Holy Ghost to persons already baptized. For presbyters, whether without the bishop, or in the presence of the bishop, are allowed, when they baptize, to anoint the baptized with the Chrism, but with Chrism which has been consecrated by the bishop; they are not allowed, however, to seal the forehead with that oil;

as we have it, do not tally with what appear to have been the contents of the letter read at Braga. And finally, the epistle seems not to have been known to Isidore of Seville, which could hardly have been the case had it been the letter read at Braga. Part of the letter may be genuine, but the sentence quoted bears every sign of being modern.

this belongs only to the bishops, when they transmit the Comforter Spirit."[1]

There are many points in which this letter deserves the attention of those who trace the history of rites rather than of doctrines. As the statement of Jerome above given is the first decided statement that Chrism in the West was used in Baptism, when administered by others than bishops, so is this of Innocent the first decided statement that that Chrism must be consecrated by the bishop. It is also the first clear proof that, after such anointing by the inferior minister, there was a second use of the Chrism by the bishop at the completion of the Baptism. It is interesting also to observe the distinction, now first clearly displayed, between Unction as such, applied to the head (as in the works of S. Ambrose) or to the breast (as in those of S. Gregory the Great), and Unction as the Seal, applied (no doubt in the form of a cross) to the forehead.[2] But

[1] *Epist.* xxv. (*ad Decent. ep. Eugub.*) § 6. The epistle is included in the collection of Dionysius, and is quoted as Innocent's by Isidore. The second Council of Seville (A.D. 619) also quotes some words of it, though without naming the source. Gallandi's text, which I have translated, differs from the editions of Dionysius, in having the word *secundi* to qualify *sacerdotes*, and inserting *pontificium* in the sentence next after.

[2] Unless we suppose the *Psychomachia* of Prudentius to be earlier. Sobriety, personified, there asks whether Christian men will allow Luxury to disgrace their heads with effeminate attire and cosmetics, "after the Seal of the forehead inscribed with oil, whereby the royal ointment was given and the everlasting chrism" (*Psych.* 360). The Spanish poet speaks in two other places of the Chrism. One of the passages (*Cathem.* vi. 125) is well known from having been adopted into the offices of the Western Church: "Remember, O worshipper of God, that thou hast passed under the holy dew of the font and

the dogmatic interest of S. Innocent's letter lies in this, that he does not conceive of Baptism, even when accompanied by Unction with that consecrated chrism, as conveying the great gift. That remains to be conveyed by the bishop himself afterwards. Innocent is often said to assert that the gift is then conveyed by the sealing of the forehead with the sacred oil. But his language does not express that notion. He actually separates the two things by the words, "*either* to seal, *or* to deliver the Spirit." He says that such a sealing was reserved for the bishops "*when* they deliver the Comforter Spirit (*cum tradunt Spiritum paracletum*)," as if it accompanied the delivery but did not convey it. His usage cannot well have differed from that which Jerome describes; and Innocent's words would most naturally be taken to mean that this sealing with the Chrism on the forehead was to be used by the bishops at the time of Laying on of Hands. While the other Unction was a part of Baptism proper, this was to be considered a part of Confirmation. But whether Innocent regarded the sealing as a part, or whether he regarded it as the whole of Confirmation, it is in Confirmation (identified, be it

laver, that thou hast been scored with the Chrism" (*te chrismate innotatum*). The other (*Cathem.* v. 156) describes, apparently, the poet's soul as a candle "steeped in the ointment of the peace-giving Chrism." These passages do not throw much light upon the doctrine. In the second the connexion of the Chrism with Baptism is seen. The first shews that it was currently believed in Spain, as elsewhere, to consecrate a man king. The epithets *perenne* and *pacificum* seem to refer respectively to the "abiding" of the spiritual Unction, and to the symbolism of the olive from which the Chrism is made.

observed, with the Laying on of Hands at Samaria) that "the Comforter Spirit" is delivered. There is a splendid fulness of thought in the addition of that one title *Paracletus*,—not found in any earlier Latin author in this connexion, though probably already incorporated into the order of service—which makes this letter almost as important doctrinally as it is from the ritual or canonical point of view. Perhaps no one saying of any author since the close of the Canon has had so powerful an effect upon Western doctrine with regard to the matter in hand as this sentence of the great precursor of S. Leo. Nothing that had yet been uttered so tended to make Confirmation appear as an independent sacrament.

Innocent died in A.D. 417. In 440 Leo succeeded to his throne. In the light of what has now been said of S. Innocent's teaching, the following words of S. Leo will be the more clear:—

"But you, beloved, whom I can address in no more suitable words than those of the blessed Apostle Peter, 'a chosen generation, a royal priesthood, a holy nation, a peculiar people,' built upon Christ, the inviolable Rock, and engrafted into our very Lord and Saviour by His true assumption of our flesh, remain steadfast in that faith which you have confessed before many witnesses, and in which, having been born again through water and the Holy Ghost, you received the Chrism of salvation and the Seal of eternal life."[1]

[1] *Serm.* xxiv. § 6. The phrase *chrisma salutis* was probably already incorporated into the formula of unction; see p. 221.

It is usual to suppose that "the Chrism of salvation and the Seal of eternal life" mean one and the same thing to Leo. It may be so; but what we have learned from S. Innocent suggests rather the separate acts of the baptismal Unction, and the Seal which accompanied the Imposition of Hands. S. Leo, at any rate, distinguishes more sharply than most others before him, between the regeneration of Baptism, complete in itself, and the gifts, which he does not describe in detail, bestowed by subsequent, yet connected, rites.

There are two other places[1] in which S. Leo speaks of the Chrism as a sacrament in almost the technical sense,—in the first of them apparently making it a different thing from the Seal. He is teaching that all the ancient mysteries are made ours in Christ.

"Let not the Jew think that it profits him to abide carnally on the surface of the letter, while he is proved to be in fact fighting against those Scriptures, which hold amongst us their own true value, instructing us by their predictions, and at the same time enriching us by the fulfilment of them. For when the Lord said, 'I, if I be lifted up, will draw all things (*omnia*) unto Me,' there remained nothing of the institutions of the law, nothing of the figures of the prophets, which did not wholly pass over into the Christian sacraments. With us is the seal of circumcision, the hallowing of the anointing oils

[1] The Epistle numbered 88 in Quesnel's edition, *ad uniuersos Germaniarum et Galliarum regionum episcopos*, is a feeble forgery.

(*chrismatum*), the consecration of priests; with us is the purity of the sacrifice, the truth of baptism, the glory of the temple."[1]

He writes to the Emperor, his namesake, about the confusion existing at Alexandria, where the Bishop, Proterius, had been murdered on Maundy Thursday, the usual day for the consecration of the Chrism.

"All the light of the heavenly sacraments is there extinguished. The offering of the Sacrifice is interrupted, the hallowing of the chrism has failed, and by the parricidal hands of wicked men all the mysteries have withdrawn themselves."[2]

It is not easy to understand why the "offering of the Sacrifice" should have been interrupted by the death of the bishop,—perhaps it was only because of the prevailing terror and agitation,—but it may be observed that Leo does not assert that the usual Paschal administration of Baptism had been stopped, as he probably would have done, had that been the case. There were, no doubt, plenty of presbyters to administer that sacrament; but Leo observes that they were unable to proceed to the completion of these Baptisms, because they had no bishop to hallow the anointing oil.

So far as I am aware, Leo never peaks directly of the Laying on of Hands (except so far as it is

[1] *Serm.* lxvi. § 2. The plural *chrismatum* seems to refer to the chrisms used for the energumens and sick, and for Confirmation respectively.

[2] *Epist.* clvi. §. 5.

implied in the *signaculum uitae aeternae*), save in connexion with the reception of persons baptized outside the Church. Of this, he speaks as others had done before him.

In one letter he deals with those "who came out of Africa or from Mauritania, and do not know what sect it was that they were baptized in:"—

"These persons know that they have been baptized, but say that they do not know what faith those who baptized them belonged to. Therefore, as they have in one way or another received the form of Baptism, they must not be baptized, but must be joined to the Catholics by Imposition of the Hand, the power (*uirtute*) of the Holy Ghost being invoked, which power they could not receive from heretics."[1]

In another:—

"Those who received Baptism from heretics, when they had not already been previously baptized, are to be confirmed by invocation of the Holy Ghost only, through the Imposition of Hands (*sola inuocatione Spiritus sancti per impositionem manuum confirmandi sunt*), because they have got but the form of Baptism without the sanctifying power (*sanctificationis uirtute*). And this rule, as you know, we declare binding, to be observed in all Churches, that the laver once entered upon (*initum*) must not be violated by any repetition, because the Apostle says, 'One Lord, one Faith, one Baptism.' Its washing must not be tampered with by any repetition, but, as we have said, only the sanctification of the Holy

[1] *Epist.* clxviii. (*ad Rustic. ep. Narbon.*) § 18.

Ghost is to be invoked, in order that what no one receives from heretics, the man may gain from Catholic bishops."[1]

It is observable, on the one hand, how S. Leo here uses the word *confirmare* almost in its modern sense; and, on the other hand, how, following previous teachers, he regards the Imposition of Hands, in these circumstances, as the means of obtaining all the spiritual benefits of Baptism, not only those which in ordinary cases, as he himself has taught, belonged to the Chrism or to the Seal.

Another letter, however, appears to allow more value to heretical baptisms:—

"If it is proved that any one has been baptized by heretics, in such a case let there be no approach to a repetition of the sacrament of regeneration; but let that only be conferred which was there wanting, namely, that through the bishop's Laying on of the Hand, he may gain the power (*uirtutem*) of the Holy Ghost."[2]

From his choice of the expression, "the sacrament of regeneration," it looks as if S. Leo felt that the man baptized by heretics might be said to be already regenerate.[3]

With S. Leo, we pass away from the main constructive period of Christian doctrine. Chalcedon

[1] *Epist.* clix. (*ad Nicet. ep. Aquil.*) § 7.

[2] *Epist.* clxvi. (*ad. Neon. ep. Ravenn.*) § 2.

[3] It has been supposed, from expressions of Cyprian and Firmilian, that Leo's predecessor, Stephen, taught as much. See art. 'Cyprian,' in Smith's *Dictionary of Christian Biography*, p. 752. The point, however, admits of being controverted.

had disposed of the last great heresy concerning the person of Christ; and S. Austin had given its death-blow to the most conspicuous heresy of the West. The period which followed was more practical than doctrinal, and theology was largely abandoned for the work of missions to the invading nations, and of developing Church organization. The great Western School of theological learning during that period was to be found in Gaul. There, the Pelagian controversy was in course of being finally threshed out. The materials with which S. Austin had furnished the Church were there digested and brought to bear; and among the Gallican divines was still found sufficient independence of mind, partly maintained by intercourse with the East, not to accept all his conclusions, or those of Rome either, unhesitatingly.

First of these Gallican divines, however, we may mention one in whom Rome and S. Austin alike had a most zealous partisan. Prosper, a native of Aquitaine, was for a time secretary to S. Leo. He stands at the head of the list of men, who, like Eugyppius in Africa a little later, and Cupezzoli and Jansen in modern times, have endeavoured to make collections of the doctrines of the great African. He gives the following summary of S. Austin's teaching about Unction:—

"Christ's name comes from chrism, that is, from unction. Every Christian is consecrated for this purpose, that he may understand himself not only to be partaker of the priestly and royal dignity, but also to be made an athlete against the devil."[1]

[1] *Sentent. ex Aug.* § cccxliv. The last words are taken from Aug. *Tract. in Ioann.* xxxiii. § 3, though with an important alteration.

Perhaps the chief interest of this quotation is its extreme meagreness when compared with the wealth of S. Austin's teaching on the subject. If Prosper's words were to be hardly pressed, he must be taken to mean that Unction was only an instructive symbol. While S. Austin's words are, "He anointed us because He made us athletes against the devil," his disciple reduces him to saying that the purpose of our consecration is to impress upon us our duty in the matter. Probably S. Prosper did not quite intend this. But it is significant that he should seize upon the one passage where S. Austin, deriving the symbolism of Unction from its use in the palaestra rather than at the bath, makes it a preparation for combat. It joins with the contemporary rise of the word *confirmare*, to show that a new line was coming to be taken with regard to the rite, and that instead of conferring a new blessing it was beginning to be thought of as only developing one already given, with a view to the increase of moral strength.

Salvian, presbyter of Marseilles, had the advantage of being highly honoured by both sides in the Semi-pelagian controversy. He thus sets forth the privileges of Christianity:—

"Perhaps it is asked what are the good things which God allots to Christian men. What, indeed, but all those things by which we believe, that is, by which we are Christians? First the Law, then the prophets, thirdly the Gospel, fourthly the Apostolic writings, lastly the gift of a new generation, the grace of Holy Baptism, the anointing of the Divine Chrism;

the effect and purpose of which is, that, as of old amongst the Hebrews, who were God's own peculiar people, when the high position of the Judges passed into the power of the Kings, God took the most approved and chosen men and called them by anointing to the kingship, so all Christian men who, after the Chrism of the Church, have done all the commandments of God, should be called to heaven to receive the reward of their labour."[1]

The mode of expression is not clear; but it looks as if Salvian still held the older theory that "the grace of Holy Baptism, and the anointing of the Divine Chrism," together constitute "the gift of a new generation," while he levels down the kingship conferred by the Chrism to nothing more than a future participation of heaven.

If this be so, he differed from Faustus, Bishop of Riez, who was the most conspicuous of the anti-Augustinian party. Faustus clearly asserts the opinion, which we have seen indirectly expressed by Leo, that even heretical Baptism makes the recipient to be new-born.

"How can you teach," he says, "that one who comes of his own accord to Baptism has derived no benefit from it, when even upon a heretic regenerated in the name of the Trinity the very virtue of the mystery by itself confers so much, that if afterwards he comes over to the faith of Christ, he needs no repetition of Baptism, but is judged to be so truly washed by the operation of grace, that he is only clothed with the benediction of the Chrism?"[2]

[1] *De Gubern. Dei* iii. § 2. [2] *De Grat. Dei* i. § 14.

Probably Faustus has no intention, in the last phrase, of excluding the Imposition of Hands; "the Benediction of the Chrism" is rather the sort of phrase which would include it, and help us towards understanding how the one act melted into the other.

In another place, which perhaps gives us the earliest example of the unqualified use of the word "Confirmation," Faustus adheres faithfully to the ancient doctrine that the Holy Spirit is given in Confirmation, marking Confirmation off from Baptism by the very name of His "coming." He is speaking of the disciples found by S. Paul at Ephesus :—

"When the Holy Ghost was come upon them, then they spoke with tongues and prophesied. See how great is the power of the Holy Ghost! In Baptism is bestowed the remission of sins; in the coming of the Holy Ghost gifts of supernatural powers are conferred, and miraculous signs are performed by the confirmed (*a confirmatis*)."[1]

A still more vigorous account of the benefits of Confirmation is found in a homily, first printed under the name of Eusebius of Emesa, but now shown to be from the same powerful hand of Faustus. The homily was delivered on Whitsunday,—one of the two days of the year on which Baptism was canonically celebrated. It is founded on the text, "In those days, saith the Lord, I will pour out of My Spirit upon all flesh."

[1] *De Spiritu Sancto* ii. § 4. This treatise has hitherto been current under the name of Paschasius, but Engelbrecht has recently vindicated it for Faustus; see his Vienna edition of the works of Faustus, p. xii., and his fuller treatise referred to on p. v.

"Let us mark," says the preacher, "the riches of the supreme goodness. What now, in the Confirmation of the novices (*in confirmandis neophytis*), the Imposition of the Hand bestows on each, the descent of the Holy Ghost upon the assembly of believers then gave to all. But because we have said that the Imposition of the Hand and Confirmation is able to confer somewhat upon him who is already born anew in Christ, perhaps some one thinks with himself, 'What good can it do me, after the mystery of Baptism, to have the services of one to confirm me (*ministerium confirmantis*)? So far as I can see, we have not obtained all from the font, if after the font we still need the addition of a new kind of thing.' That is not so, dear brethren; listen to me. Military discipline requires that when an emperor has received a man into the number of his soldiers, he should not only put his mark on the man, but should also equip him with sufficient arms for battle. So in the case of the baptized man, that Benediction is a protection. You have found a soldier; find him the implements of warfare. Is it of any use for a parent to confer a vast property on his little child, unless he takes care also to provide him with a guardian? So the Paraclete is to the regenerate in Christ a keeper and a consoler and a guardian. Therefore the word of God says, 'Except the Lord keep the city, the watchman waketh but in vain.' And so the Holy Ghost Who came down upon the waters of Baptism with His saving illapse, bestows at the font absolutely all that is needed to restore innocence; in Confirmation

He grants a development for progress in grace (*in fonte plenitudinem tribuit ad innocentiam, in confirmatione augmentum praestat ad gratiam*). Because in this world, if we live, we must walk all our days among invisible foes and dangers, therefore in Baptism we are born again to life, after Baptism we are confirmed for combat; in Baptism we are washed clean,[1] after Baptism we are fortified. Thus, if we pass away at once, the benefits of regeneration are all that we want; but if we are to live, the help of Confirmation is necessary for us. Regeneration by itself saves those who are soon to be received into the peace of the world of bliss; Confirmation arms and equips those who are to be reserved for the conflicts and battles of this world. He who after Baptism reaches death with the innocence which he has acquired, unspotted, is confirmed by death; for he cannot sin after death."

The preacher proceeds to parallel Baptism with the redeeming work of Christ, and Confirmation with the gift of the spirit which followed after it:—

"If here, perhaps, we should wish to inquire what good the coming of the Holy Ghost could do the Apostles after Christ had suffered and risen again, the Lord Himself clearly expounds this to them: 'What I say to you,' He says, 'ye cannot bear now; but when He, the Spirit of truth, is come, He will teach you all truth.' You see that when the Holy Ghost is poured into us, the faithful heart is enlarged to prudence and constancy. So, before the descent

[1] Read *abluimur*. The other reading *alimur* makes no sense.

of the Holy Ghost, the Apostles are terrified even to denial; but after His visitation, they are armed even to martyrdom, despising deliverance. According to this, we are redeemed through Christ; but through the Holy Ghost we are enlightened with the gift of spritual wisdom, are built up, instructed, furnished, completed, so as to be able to hear that voice of the Holy Ghost, 'I will inform thee, and teach thee in the way wherein thou shalt go.' Of the Holy Ghost we receive it that we are made spiritual, because 'the natural man perceiveth not the things which are of the Spirit of God.' Of the Holy Ghost we receive it that we should be wise to discern between good and evil, to love righteous things, to reject unrighteous; that we should fight against wickedness and pride, and resist luxury, and divers enticements, and defiling and unworthy desires. Of the Holy Ghost we receive it that, being kindled with the love of life and the passion for glory, we are able to lift up our minds from earthly things to things above which are Divine. For to this end we have been granted reason and sense, by the endowment of nature and by the restoration of a second birth, that according to the Apostle's language, we should mind rather the things which are above, not the things which are upon the earth."[1]

[1] The collection of homilies of which this forms one was first published by Gaigny in 1547, under the idea that they were translated from Eusebius of Emesa. They will be found in De la Bigne's *Bibliotheca Patrum*, vol. vi. p. 618, foll., from the addition of A. Schott, ascribed to "Eusebius episcopus Gallicanus." No such personage is known for certain; but it is quite possible that a man of that common name may have made the collection. The sermons have been thought

So noble a statement of the doctrine of the Laying on of Hands deserves a word or two of comment. Baptism and Confirmation are not confused with each other, as if but one gift was conveyed by both in common. Baptism is a cleansing, a restoration of immunity from guilt; it saves. It is also, and this in the clearest and most decided way, a regeneration; the baptized man lives a new life; he is the child, if the infant child, of God. It answers to the work of Christ for us. Confirmation answers to the special work of the Holy Spirit. It is to us what His descent on the day of Pentecost was to the Apostles; it is His coming, His personal infusion into the believer's heart, attended with the utmost important and varied results, in the way of intellectual and moral strength and development. The description suits an age when Baptism and Confirmation were beginning to be frequently separated in practice, and men were forced to inquire into the value of a second rite. Yet the fine sentence with which the above extract closes appears to suggest that Confirmation and its gift are a part of that whole process described as the *reparatio secundae natiuitatis*, "the restoration of a second birth." It is not regarded as an "additional

to be by different Gallican authors, as Maximus of Riez, Faustus of Riez, and others, but all of a good date. Casimir Oudin (*Comment. de Scriptoribus et Scriptis Eccl.* tom. i. p. 412) learnedly endeavours to shew that they were all by the last-named prelate. Engelbrecht (p. xxvii.) unhesitatingly adopts the same conclusion. The theology of the homily with which we are specially concerned bears it out. The bold injection, in the last sentence which I have quoted, of the *naturae munere* before *secundae natiuitatis reparatione* is quite in the style of the anti-Augustinian school.

thing of a new kind" (*adiectio noui generis*), but rather as a further acquisition (*augmentum*) in the same kind; although the preacher's words forbid us to say that it is only an increased measure of the gift of the Holy Ghost already given, which he never implies.

The anonymous author of the *Praedestinatus*, who warmly took the same side as Faustus in the question of the day, thus inveighs against the way in which the Augustinian theology appeared to refer all blessings to a hidden future:—

"The adoption of sons is not promised in Baptism; it is conferred. But you say of that which we have already received, 'Hope that is seen is not hope.' To us, all hope is seen to consist in the consecration of Baptism; therefore because our hope is seen, it is not hope! In the anointing of Christ's Chrism we behold the confirmation (*firmamentum*) of our hope; therefore the hope that is seen is not hope! We see the Body of Christ, which is our hope; therefore the hope that is seen is not hope! We fix our gaze upon the Blood of Christ, which it our redemption; therefore the hope that is seen is not hope! You have emptied all the sacraments; you have made void the mysteries; and like faithful and fitting quartermasters of Antichrist you are preparing a place for him to which, when we have been cast out by some, he may succeed. For what the Apostle says about the joys of this world, 'The hope that is seen is not hope,' you have transferred to the Divine mysteries. What he mentions in reference to fleeting and perish-

able things, you have attached to Holy Baptism itself."[1]

The passage is interesting as shewing that the author more or less consciously felt that Baptism was a double sacrament in the same sort of sense as the Eucharist, containing in itself two sacraments. The Untion is the *firmamentum* of the hope which Baptism, with its adoption and sanctification, gives,—much in the same way as at a later time, in the *Ordo Romanus*, the giving of the Chalice after the Bread is described as the "confirmation" of the communicants.[2]

Gennadius, like Salvian, was a presbyter of Marseilles, and, like the rest of that Church, inclined to the Semipelagian side, being a great admirer of Faustus. In the doctrinal work which he published as a vindication of his orthodoxy, he speaks as follows about the reception of heretics:—

"Any who have been baptized among those heretics who baptize in the confession of the Holy Trinity, and then come to us, are to be received indeed as baptized, lest the invocation or confession of the Holy Trinity should be annulled; but they must be taught afresh, and instructed in what sense the mystery of the Holy Trinity is held in the Church; and if they agree to believe it, or are willing to confess it, being now purified by integrity of faith, they should be confirmed by the Imposition of the Hand. But if they are little children, or dull of comprehension, and unable to take in doctrine, those who present them, according to the custom of Baptism, answer for them;

[1] *Praedest.* iii. § 25.

[2] See Ducange, *s.v. Confirmare.*

and so being fortified by the Imposition of the Hand and Chrism, they may be admitted to the Eucharistic mysteries."[1]

From the ritual point of view this passage is of value, as it shews how the Imposition of the Hand and the Chrism were coming to be two names for one and the same rite. It is not to be supposed that intelligent adults only required one rite of admission to the Church, after being christened in heresy, while children and the less intelligent required two. The "Imposition of the Hand" in the first case is equivalent to the "Imposition of the Hand and Chrism" in the second. It means that the Unction upon the brow at the time of the Laying on of Hands was becoming increasingly "*the* Chrism."

Another passage from the same work shews what doctrinal value Gennadius ascribed to the rite. He is drawing a detailed parallel between the baptism of blood and the normal Baptism:—

"The candidate for Baptism confesses his faith before the bishop (*sacerdote*), and answers to his questions; this the martyr does before the persecutor, both confessing his faith, and answering the questions. He, after his confession, is either sprinkled with water or plunged in it; the martyr is either sprinkled with blood or bathed in fire. He, by the Imposition of the Hand of the pontiff, receives the Holy Spirit; the other is made the dwelling-place of the Holy Spirit, inasmuch as 'it is not he that speaks, but the Spirit of the Father Which speaks in him.' The former

[1] *De Eccl. Dogm.* § 52.

partakes of the Eucharist in commemoration of the Lord's death; the latter dies with Christ Himself."[1]

There had been no blood-baptisms for nearly two hundred years when Gennadius wrote this book,[2] and there is an air of more primitive antiquity about the language which makes it probable that the learned presbyter was using the words of an earlier divine. The presence of the bishop at baptisms, the immediate sequence of the Laying on of Hands and of the Holy Communion, were not so necessarily to be taken for granted in Gennadius's time in Gaul; nor perhaps was the doctrine of the Laying on of Hands generally so robust. But Gennadius at any rate makes it his own. The effect of the Imposition of the bishop's Hand in Baptism is to receive the indwelling of the Holy Ghost.

We return to the Roman Church. Not long after the time of Gennadius, a deacon of the Roman Church, named John, wrote an interesting letter to Senarius, the friend of Avitus and of other distinguished Churchmen of the fifth and sixth centuries, describing, amongst other things, the baptismal ceremonies used in his time at Rome. This letter appears to have had considerable influence upon the thoughts and language of the writers of the next four centuries. After speaking of the actual Baptism, he relates how the newly baptized was arrayed in white robes, and then—

"His head is anointed (*perungitur*) with the

[1] *De Eccl. Dogm.* § 74.

[2] The book was sent to Gelasius I., who was Bishop of Rome A.D. 492–496.

unction of the sacred Chrism, in order that the baptized may understand that the kingship and the priestly mystery have met in him."

After this—

"To express more fully the representation of priesthood, the head of him who is receiving the new birth (*renascentis*) is attired with a decoration of linen; because the priests of the former times always adorned their heads with a certain mystical covering."

John insists on the necessity of the Chrism being consecrated by the bishop alone, in words which shew acquaintance both with S. Jerome's teaching and with S. Innocent's, and enforces it by various Old Testament analogies, and adds :—

"Rightly, therefore, the Apostolic power of Benediction and Unction is traditionally reserved for him who undoubtedly holds the chief place in the Church's orders."

He allows that there are cases where "force of necessity" compels presbyters to "make the holy Chrism, as is said to be done in Africa at the present time," where the Catholic bishops had all been exiled by Hunneric; but he explains it by saying that what would otherwise have been very perturbing, was set right by the bishops having themselves given leave to do it, so that it might still be considered the bishops' own act.

More valuable from the dogmatic point of view is the passage with which this fragment of a letter closes, in which John endeavours to answer Senarius'

question, "Whether it is any disadvantage to a man or not, if after being baptized, he should pass out of this life without the unction of the Chrism and the bishop's Benediction." He replies to this inquiry thus:—

"About this point I would rather hear more fully from the learned than say anything myself. My own impression, however, without prejudice to a better understanding and the full judgment of greater authorities, . . . I will briefly give. Take a similitude from this first birth by which we have our origin, in order to understand that second birth, by which we truly live and in which we are justified. When the babe has been born, and has obtained a share in this light, we say that a perfect man has been born, and is of the same substance as he that begat him,—that is, a rational, mortal, animal,—although the one is big, the other little; for these are words which express accidents and not nature. If therefore such additions are made as contribute to growing age, is anything added to the definition of nature? Far from it; the property of nature does not admit of extension or diminution."

Unhappily, the little disquisition here ends with either the patience of the scribe or the destruction of his manuscript; but John was no doubt about to say, after the manner of Faustus of Riez, that the man regenerate through Baptism was perfectly regenerate, and could not be made more so, but that there was abundant room for growth and strengthening in the Divine life, and that these were the gifts

of "Unction and Benediction," or "Benediction and Unction."[1]

The only other Roman Churchman whom we have to consider is S. Gregory the Great. This epoch-making man exercised a special influence upon the fortunes of Confirmation. Not that doctrinally he altered men's conception of the rite; but it is well known that he materially affected the judgments of the later Church with regard to the mode of its administration. It has too hastily been assumed in some quarters that Church history, and the history of Confirmation in particular, is the record of a long series of encroachments by the first order of the sacred ministry upon the prerogatives of the second. One of the main contentions of Daillé's bitter treatise *De Confirmatione* is that originally all presbyters were recognised to have the right of performing the acts which now pass by that name; and that by a succession of repressive enactments the bishops wrested the right from them. As a matter of fact, it appears that a movement of almost exactly the opposite kind took place. Whereas, originally, it was a rare thing, comparatively speaking, for any but a bishop to baptize at all, except in cases of sickness or danger,

[1] The letter will be found in Migne, vol. lix. p. 399, very badly edited. The author's date, as Muratori and Gallandi shew, against Mabillon and Martene, who had overlooked the point, is fixed by the mention of the African presbyters. At the time of the later John the Deacon, who wrote the life of S. Gregory, there were no presbyters in Africa. There is nothing in the letter to conflict with a date in the beginning of the sixth century; and the not very common name of the *Dominus merito illustris semperque magnificus Senarius* could not be better identified than with the friend of Avitus and Ennodius, who is also highly spoken of by Cassiodorus.

later, when the Church came to be more widely spread, and dioceses were large, it became necessary to allow larger freedom of action in this respect to the presbyters in charge of country districts. These, no doubt, rightly understanding Confirmation, especially that portion of it which consisted in Unction, to be a part of Baptism, were naturally inclined to suppose that the permission to baptize included the permission to confirm. They had done so in innocent ignorance at first; but no doubt some proceeded to jealous contumacy. The growing frequency with which the presbyters are forbidden to "seal" by Roman decrees and conciliar canons during the fifth, and sixth, and the early part of the seventh centuries, shews how difficult it was to stem the spirit of advance on their part. Innocent's letter to Decentius marks one stage in the process of concession to that spirit; Gregory's two letters to January, Bishop of Cagliari, mark a further stage.

At first S. Gregory had endeavoured to uphold the rule of his predecessor, which had been framed with a view to distinguishing between Unction proper and the Seal or Laying on of the Hand. He wrote to January:—

"Bishops must not venture to seal baptized 'Infantes' twice over upon the forehead with the chrism; but presbyters should anoint candidates for Baptism upon the breast, so that the bishops afterwards may properly anoint them on the forehead."[1]

[1] *Epist.* lib. iv. 9. Perhaps by *infantes* Gregory may mean infants

The restriction, however, gave great offence—in Sardinia, it is to be presumed,—and thereupon S. Gregory gave up the point. A decree from Rome by this time ran as law through the Western Church, and Gregory decided, for the first time in the history of Latin Christianity, that presbyters might, as a general rule, in the normal exercise of their office, without special commission for each occasion, confirm, when bishops were not easily to be got at,—still, however, it is to be supposed, with chrism supplied by the bishop.

He wrote a second letter to the Bishop of Cagliari :—

"It has also come to our ears that some were scandalized at our forbidding presbyters to touch with the chrism those who are to be baptized. The

in the natural sense. Priests then, as deacons now amongst ourselves, were allowed to baptize young children with less restraint than grown-up people. Gregory's wording is a little ambiguous in several points. Did he mean that in *case* a presbyter had sealed an "infans" on the forehead, the bishop was to refrain from doing it again? or does he imply that for some reason the bishop himself might sometimes take a fancy to repeat the act? The latter alternative seems unintelligible, but the former surrenders entirely the inherent *power* of confirming (as distinct from the permission) to the presbyter. Again, the use of the word *baptizandos* in the next clause might be taken to mean something different from *baptizatos* just before, conceding to presbyters only the right to anoint as a preliminary to Baptism. This, however, is unlikely, both in itself, and from Gregory's use of the gerundive in the next letter to January. It will be remembered that the rule was still in force which prohibited presbyters from using chrism which had not been made by the bishop; so that Gregory's concession, whether in this letter or in the next, did not amount to quite as much as that made, according to the deacon John, by the African bishops; though even in that case, the act of the presbyter was reckoned to be the act of the permitting bishop.

fact is that we only acted in accordance with the ancient usage of our own Church; but certainly, if there are persons who are aggrieved at the thing, then, where bishops are not to be found, we give leave for presbyters duly to touch with the chrism the candidates for Baptism, even upon their foreheads."[1]

The extent of the concession is still left a little doubtful; for Gregory does not say what is to happen if by-and-by the person whom they "touched with the chrism" comes within range of his bishop. But it is to be presumed that subsequent divines were right when they regarded Gregory's rescript as a permission actually to confirm. Theoretically, then, Gregory had put the bishop and the presbyter, with regard to Confirmation, in the same position which for many centuries they have held in the Eastern Church,—the presbyter empowered regularly to confirm, though with the bishop's chrism.

Practically, however, Gregory's permission was not intended to come to much, and it never ceased to be, in the West, the normal thing for the bishop to confirm with his own hands. He speaks of the Confirmation tours of the Sicilian bishops as a matter of course.[2] He insists upon their confirming any persons who are not certain whether they have been confirmed.[3] In an epistle written to a bishop who was, like Gregory himself, a great invalid, he speaks as if

[1] *Epist.* lib. iv. 26.
[2] *Epist.* lib. xiii. 18.
[3] *Epist.* lib. xiv. 17.

the people would not obtain Confirmation at all, if the bishop could not get to them:—

"You will pay visits, brother, as in duty bound, to those Churches which you can reach without labour, in order that those who by the mercy of God are baptized there, may not have to go unconfirmed (*inconsignati*)." [1]

Upon the doctrinal side of Confirmation, the last of the four Western doctors has little to teach. I do not know of more than one place in his writings where he touches directly upon the subject.[2] He says in a homily to his fellow-bishops:—

"And through us the faithful come to Baptism, are blessed by our prayers, and by the Imposition of our Hands receive the Holy Ghost from God, and they attain to the kingdom of heaven; while behold, we, through our negligence, move downwards." [3]

He speaks more vaguely in a comment upon the words of Job, "The rock poured me out rivers of oil." This, he says, may mean sacred doctrines; or else—

"By the name of oil may be meant the unction of the Holy Ghost itself, concerning which it is said by the prophet, 'The yoke shall be destroyed because of the anointing.' The yoke is destroyed because of the anointing, inasmuch as when we are anointed

[1] *Epist.* lib. x. 45 (*ad Ecclesium ep. Clusinum*).

[2] He uses the customary language about laying hands on heretics, or anointing them, as the case may be, by which they "receive the Holy Ghost."—*Epist.* lib. xi. 67.

[3] *Hom. in Euang.* xvii. § 18. I owe my knowledge of this passage to Bishop Kingdon's excellent Paddock Lectures on *God Incarnate*.

with the grace of the Holy Spirit, we are delivered from our captivity and bondage; and when the insolent dominion of the evil spirit is cast off, the yoke is broken in pieces, which weighed down our free necks. Concerning this oil it is written again, 'My beloved hath a vineyard in the horn of the son of oil.' The son of oil is the appellation of the faithful people, which is begotten to the faith of God by the inward unction of the Holy Ghost. So, when the holy Church is depressed by many tribulations, let her call to mind the gifts of the Spirit, and the wonderful Gospel which she still possesses, and let her bewail her own silence, saying, 'The rock poured me out rivers of oil.'"[1]

The expressions are too slight to build upon; but it looks as if Gregory drew a less clear distinction than many other Fathers between the motion which first "begets us to the faith of God" and the unction which furnishes us with "the gifts of the Spirit." If so, his surrender to the aggressions of the Sardinian presbyters is the less to be wondered at.

With Gregory the Great (who died A.D. 604) closes the truly patristic period in the Western Church. But before ending our account of the teaching of the Western Fathers, it will be convenient to examine a few great representative divines of the age between the patristic period and that of the Schoolmen. It is, of course, impossible sharply to divide one period from another, and there were, no doubt, vigorous and independent thinkers and theologians during the

[1] *Moral.* xix. § 15.

second half-millennium of our era. But the chief writers of those centuries,—besides mystical expositors of Holy Scripture, and biographers of saints,—were devout antiquaries, canonists and ritualists, who amassed and preserved the lore of the Fathers, to serve as material for the great intellectual outburst which succeeded them. To them, therefore, we may well turn for a summary of the traditions which had come down to them.

The Church of Spain furnishes us with two excellent examples. S. Isidore, Bishop of Seville from A.D. 600 to 636, thus gathers up the teaching of earlier doctors on the subject of the Chrism and Laying on of Hands:—

"The anointing Chrism was first composed and also made by Moses in the Exodus, at the command of the Lord, and with it Aaron and his sons were first anointed for a testimony of priesthood and holiness. Afterwards kings also were consecrated with the same oil; from which they were called 'Anointeds,' as it is written, 'Touch not Mine Anointed;' and at that time only kings and priests received the mystical unction, by which the Christ was foreshadowed; whose name itself is derived from the chrism. But ever since our Lord, the true King and the eternal Priest, was anointed by God the Father with the mystical heavenly ointment, not only pontiffs and kings, but all the Church is consecrated with the anointing Chrism, inasmuch as each person is a member of the eternal King and Priest. Therefore, because we are a priestly and a royal race, after the

laver we are anointed, in order to bear the name of Christ. But that after Baptism the Holy Ghost is given by means of the bishops together with the Laying on of Hands, we remember that the Apostles did so in the Acts of the Apostles."

S. Isidore then quotes Acts xix. 1–6, and viii. 14–17, and adds the pious caution of S. Austin:—

"We are able, indeed, to receive the Holy Ghost, but we are not able to give Him, but invoke the Lord that He may be given."

He concludes his account by quoting in full the letter of "the blessed Pope Innocent" with regard to the minister "to whom it specially belongs to do this (*a quo potissimum fiat*)."[1]

The other Spanish divine whom we may cite is Hildefonsus, Bishop of Toledo from A.D. 657 to 667. His work on Holy Baptism modestly disclaims all idea of originality, and may indeed well do so, seeing that Hildefonsus has done little more than re-edit a work which served Isidore also as a foundation for the book just quoted. This earlier work was composed by Justinian, Bishop of Valencia in Spain in the middle of the preceding century.[2]

Hildefonsus' book describes in order the whole process of initiation into Christianity from conversion onwards,—exorcism, the unction of catechumens, the position of the *competentes*, the delivery of the Creed, the contents of the Creed, with a remarkably full

[1] *De Eccles. Officiis* ii. 26 foll.

[2] See Smith and Wace *Dictionary of Christian Biography* art. "Hildefonsus."

treatment of the doctrine of the Holy Ghost, the baptismal renunciations, the Baptism itself. After this he proceeds:—

"As soon as the man, who has been plunged in the waters in the likeness of Christ's death, has been brought again out of the waters to the hope of resurrection, a song of thanksgiving is sung for his deliverance, and he is brought forwards to be touched with the sacred Chrism, in order that he may be anointed with the Spirit of God, and may be, and be called, a Christian, from the name and unction of Christ."

He then traces the history of the rite in almost the same words as S. Isidore, and continues:—

"So with this holy Chrism the man is outwardly anointed, and inwardly the power (*uirtus*) of the Holy Ghost falls upon him (*illabitur*), so that as the whole man has been purified by the laver, the whole man may be enriched (*pinguescat*) by the unction of the Spirit,—the soul receiving power from that unction of the Holy Spirit, to know God as its indweller, to love Him Whom it has received into itself, to be with Him always, to be governed by Him and do His will; never to grieve Him, because the man has been sealed with Him on the day of his redemption; to be among the members of Christ one with Christ, inasmuch as he is vitalised and governed by the Spirit of Christ."

After quoting several remarks of S. Austin's about the value of the spiritual unction, and dwelling on the distribution of gifts among the members of

Christ, S. Hildefonsus gives at length an interpretation of "the sevenfold Spirit" from Gregory the Great, and then discusses the Imposition of the Hand.

"The very Truth, Who calls us by Himself the Way, to Himself the Life, in His own person gave us an example of the Imposition of the Hand. S. Mark says, that when they brought young children to Him, that He should touch them, He embraced them, and laying His hand upon them, blessed them. The effect of this act is, that when the words of blessing are uttered, the Spirit is poured upon the person blessed; when he is touched with the hands, the energy of spiritual power is symbolized. This pattern (*forma*) of Laying on of the Hand, in imitation of our Lord's own act, has been so widely followed in the sacred services, that every little one,—that is, every one made lowly by faith and spiritual obedience,—receives from God through the bishop (*sacerdotem*) the sanctifying virtue. Thus Jesus blesses, out of the power of His Divinity; He lays on hands, in order that the humanity which He assumed may be effectual and operative to salvation. Jesus blesses with His mouth, and touches with His hands, because He sanctifies in virtue of being the Word. Jesus blesses and lays on hands, because what the power of the Godhead signifies, the humanity of the Redeemer accomplishes. . . . With wholesome effect, therefore, after Christ's example, the hand is laid upon the faithful by the bishop with blessing, because to him is committed by Divine authority this power,—that at (*in*) the blessing of his mouth the pouring on of the Spirit is effected,

and at (*in*) the Laying on of his Hand the touch of spiritual grace grows strong. After Baptism is the fitting time for the Holy Ghost to be given, together with the Laying on of the Hand; for thus the Apostle is proved to have done in the Acts of the Apostles."

S. Hildefonsus quotes the two passages, and continues, like S. Isidore:—

"As it is true that we can receive the Holy Ghost by Divine gift, so are we unable to give Him by power of our own. But that He may be given, we invoke the Lord, the bountiful bestower of that same grace, that at (*in*) this ministry of our supplication the grace of the Divine power (*uirtutis*) may be conferred—God performing the whole operation, when He both makes us to pray, and the person who is blessed receives the sanctification, and God Himself pours the sanctification in its fulness upon him."

Then follows S. Innocent's letter about the minister of Confirmation, and Hildefonsus goes on to say that "after the washing of the font, after obtaining newness of life, after the unction of the Spirit," the man must be taught to say the Lord's Prayer, which he thereupon expounds.[1]

In England, forty or fifty years later, the Venerable Bede, in whose person all the learning of the time was embodied, in his brief notes upon the Acts of the Apostles, repeats the traditional language. Philip, he says, if he had been an Apostle, "would himself have been able to lay hands" on the Samaritan converts, "that they might receive the Holy Ghost;

[1] *De Cognitione Baptismi* § cxxii.–cxxxii.

for this belongs (*debetur*) only to the bishops." Bede enforces this by the decree of Innocent, though without naming him. Upon S. Paul's question to the disciples at Ephesus, "Did ye receive the Holy Ghost?" he remarks, "That is, did you, after Baptism, receive the Imposition of the Hand, by which the Holy Ghost is ordinarily given (*dari solet*)?" And in his life of S. Cuthbert, he speaks of the diligent way in which that saint performed the ordinary duties of the episcopate, "going about his diocese, giving the precepts of salvation to country-side, and cottage, and hamlet, and also laying the hand on those who had been lately christened, for the receiving of the grace of the Holy Ghost."[1]

[1] *Vit. pros. S. Cuthb.* § xxix. If the Commentary upon the Psalms which bears his name were rightly ascribed to Bede, then the *debetur*, which he obsequiously borrows from Innocent in the notes on the Acts, must have had a modified significance for himself. For the compiler of the notes on the twenty-sixth Psalm (like other mediæval authors; see Gore *Church and the Ministry* note F.) ranges himself very sturdily on the side of S. Jerome for the original rights of the presbytery as against the bishop. The doctrine of Confirmation, however, is unchanged. After giving S. Austin's words about the Unction spoken of in the Latin title of the Psalm, this writer proceeds:—"And well may the faithful soul thus speak about the first two unctions" (namely of the "illumination" which leads us to renounce Satan, and of the "confirmation" by which we come to share Christ's name) "in order that, proving itself not ungrateful for these, it may be found worthy to be brought to the third for which it longs. But it should be understood that that Unction which comes through the Laying on of Hands by the bishops, as if it were different from the two forenamed, and is commonly called 'Confirmation,' is really the same as the second, but through encroaching pride (*propter arrogantiam*) it is not allowed to any and every priest (*singulis sacerdotibus*),—like many other things." Bede, however, does not mention this Commentary on the Psalms in his catalogue of his own writings, and it is generally agreed now that the work is not his. The unknown author was trusting to a false lead when he made his antiquarian statement

The learning of Bede, and of Western Europe, passed, through Egbert and the schools of York, to Alcuin. As is to be expected, he frequently uses the language of the Fathers about the gift of the Holy Spirit in Baptism.

"In Christ's Baptism is the remission of sins, and sanctification, and the gift of the Holy Ghost, as John testifies, who says, 'This is He Who baptizeth with the Holy Ghost.'"[1]

"Christ is so called from the chrism,—Anointed from the anointing,—because His name is poured out upon all the faithful with the grace of the Holy Ghost in Baptism."[2]

Instances might easily be multiplied. But Alcuin's letter to the Brethren of Lyons about various Spanish errors shews that he, like all others before him, except (if he be an exception) Maximus of Turin, still reckoned Confirmation as a part of that sacrament, and the part which conveyed this special gift. This he did, although, now, it was almost as a matter of course separated from Baptism by an interval, as the mention of the first Communion between the two proves. There, after describing the right method of performing and understanding the earlier parts of the baptismal ritual, he continues:—

"Then he is clothed in white raiment, to signify (*propter*) the joy of regeneration, and purity of life,

regarding the minister of Confirmation; but he was doubtless right when he asserted that the Unction administered by the bishop was not originally distinct from the Unction which (when Confirmation and Baptism were dissevered) accompanied Baptism.

[1] *Expos. in Psalm.* cxxxi. 18. [2] *Compend. in Cant. Cant.* i. 2.

and the glory of angelic splendour. Then his head is anointed with the sacred Chrism, and covered with a mystic covering, that he may understand that he, who was once accursed, now bears the dignity of the kingship and the priesthood, according to the Apostle, 'Ye are a royal race, offering yourselves to the living God, a holy sacrifice, well pleasing to God.' Thus he is confirmed with the Body and Blood of the Lord, to be one of His members, Who died and rose again for him. Finally (*nouissime*), by the Imposition of the Hand of the chief priest he receives the Spirit of sevenfold grace, that he who has in Baptism been endowed through grace with eternal life, may be fortified through the Holy Ghost to preach to others (*ad praedicandum aliis*)."[1]

It is very interesting to note, appearing for the first time in this late utterance, the belief that Confirmation is not merely a help to the Christian in his struggle with temptation, but a consecration to a life of service for mankind,—a life of "preaching to others."

Kindled by the teaching of Alcuin, Charles the Great instituted an inquiry into the way in which the clergy were instructed by their bishops to administer and interpret the baptismal ceremonies. He issued a

[1] *Epist.* xc. The same words occur among his works as a separate treatise under the title *De Baptismi Caeremoniis*. The reading in the last sentence must obviously be *uita aeterna*, not *uitae aeternae*, though Raban appears to quote the words in the latter form (*De Inst. Cler.* i. xxx.). It is now universally recognised that the book *De Diuinis Officiis*, which formerly went under Alcuin's name, belongs to the eleventh century.

paper of questions to the metropolitans, embracing a great number of points in detail, of which the last was "Why is the head anointed with the sacred Chrism, and covered with a mystic covering, and the man confirmed with the Body and Blood of the Lord?" It will be observed that the form of the question corresponds exactly with the words of Alcuin last quoted, which again are partly taken from John the deacon of Rome, or possibly from some source common to both John and Alcuin.

The circular to the metropolitans produced several treatises still extant, bearing a strong resemblance to each other. Odilbert, Bishop of Milan, Amalarius, Bishop of Treves, Leidrad, Bishop of Lyons, and Magnus, Bishop of Sens, amongst the rest, hastened to explain what they and their suffragans taught upon these points. None of them suggests that any other gift is given at the font besides remission of sins, and regeneration, by union with Christ and His Church. The Unction of the head is, to them all, a consecration to the priestly and royal office, "to offer always to God," as Amalarius says, "the sacrifices of an undefiled manner of life."

Odilbert sent a very humble response, and quotations from other authors without note or comment of his own. The author quoted upon the sections of most interest to us was John the Deacon.[1]

[1] The reply is given by Mabillon *Vet. Anal.* vol. iv. p. 317. The others will be found in Migne's Patrologia, as well as the paper of instructions issued to his clergy by Jesse, Bishop of Amiens, which is founded upon Alcuin.

It is interesting to note that Amalarius goes no further than the Unction of the head. He had not been specially asked about Confirmation proper, so he says nothing about it. As Confirmation belonged to the bishops, not the presbyters, it had not come within the scope of Charles' inquiry.

Leidrad, on the other hand, whose work shews much more reading—including Tertullian's treatise on the subject—follows S. Austin in not making very clear the distinction between Unction proper and Confirmation, but mentions both. He quotes the words of Scripture which tell how the Spirit of God came upon David from the day when Samuel anointed him, and adds:—

"It is to be observed that after the unction, or rather by means of the unction, the Spirit of the Lord came upon David, even as we believe that in the Church the Holy Ghost is given through the anointing of the Chrism and the Imposition of the Hand. For as in Baptism is given the remission of sins, so through Unction the sanctification of the Spirit is applied. . . . The Laying on of the Hand is used, in order that the Holy Ghost may be invited through prayer and benediction; and thereupon that Comforter, after the bodies are cleansed, blessed, and anointed, willingly descends from the Father."

Leidrad then replies to a question which the Emperor had not asked, but which he says is asked by some, namely, how it is that "when the baptismal font can in no wise be sanctified, nor remission of sins bestowed, without the Holy Ghost, there is still

need for the Laying on of Hands." It is, he says, because there are many ways in which the Holy Ghost is given, not only in Baptism, but also after. He instances the threefold manner in which the Apostles themselves received the Spirit,—"in their Baptism," on the night of the Resurrection, and on the day of Pentecost, on which last occasion they "received the Holy Ghost," he says, "when the Lord was now sitting on His throne, in order that they might have divers gifts in the same Spirit,—'the gift of healing, the working of miracles, prophecy, discerning of spirits, divers kinds of tongues, the interpretation of tongues.' But we believe that the Holy Ghost is given, not for the acquisition of these lofty gifts only, but also for every good work; for the Apostle says, 'As many as are led by the Spirit of God, they are sons of God.' Therefore in Baptism is given the remission of sins, in the Laying on of Hands are bestowed the gifts of miraculous powers (*uirtutum*), as the Apostle Peter says, 'Let every one of you be baptized in the name of our Lord Jesus Christ for the remission of sins, that ye may receive the gift of the Holy Ghost.'"[1]

The reply sent in by Magnus to the inquiries of Charles was very short. He spoke of the white raiment of the neophytes, and of the sacred Chrism, and of the mystic covering of the head, in almost Alcuin's words, and added:—

"When all the sacraments of Baptism are accomplished, finally (*nouissime*) they receive the Spirit of

[1] *De Sacram. Bapt.* § 7.

sevenfold grace from the chief priest through the Laying on of the Hand, that they may be strengthened in the right faith through the Holy Ghost. And to this end the Laying on of the Hand is used, that through the benediction the Holy Spirit may be invoked and invited. For it is to be remarked that just as the other sacraments of Baptism are performed visibly by the priests, and invisibly consecrated by the Lord, so also the grace of the Holy Ghost is transmitted to the faithful by the Laying on of the Hands of the bishops and is confirmed by the Lord."

But before sending in his paper, Magnus had had the acuteness to apply to Theodulf, Bishop of Orleans, to know what answers he ought to give. This prelate, Alcuin's "great competitor" (to use the words of Dr. Stubbs) "in the restoration of learning in France," sent Magnus a book, which, he says, had made him turn over a great many volumes of the Fathers, and "Oh!" he exclaims, as others after him may well exclaim, "I wish the work were as effectively done as it was gladly undertaken!"

Theodulf answers with sufficient fulness all the points raised by Charles. His account of the "sacrament of Baptism" itself is rich and precise. It is a washing with the water from the side of Christ, and therefore forms one of "the two chief sacraments of the Holy Church." The Holy Ghost descends from heaven, in response to the invocation of God, and imparts to the consecrated waters a purifying and regenerative force. Thereby, the baptized man is restored to the image of the Holy Trinity; and having

been through sin a child of wrath, he is made through grace the child of God.

Upon the Chrism, with its royalty and priesthood, Theodulf does not dwell long; though, after expounding the mystical coronation which followed, he returns to it, and says:—

"The Spirit of sevenfold grace is also granted through the anointing with the Chrism, so that the recipients are found meet to be the habitation, not only of the Spirit, Who is of one substance with the Father and the Son, but of the whole sacred Trinity."

But this, he implies, is not to be attributed to the unction administered by the presbyter, but to that development of it which accompanies the Laying on of Hands. Far his longest section is devoted to the doctrine of Confirmation, about which he had not been asked. From it, Magnus culled the sentence above quoted, which draws the parallel between this and "the other sacraments of Baptism." Theodulf, following S. Innocent, restricts the administration of it to the bishops, and then proceeds to draw out in a mystical manner the reason why "the Comforter Spirit," Who is given through the Laying on of Hands, is called also "the Spirit of sevenfold grace," working out the seven gifts after the manner of earlier teachers, with great beauty and tenderness.

The spirit of ritualistic research was abroad, and we find the younger Amalarius, deacon of Metz, who was one of the most distinguished pupils of Alcuin's later period at Tours, commenting some years later on the custom of making the novices put their lighted tapers

into the baptismal water to symbolize that descent of the Holy Spirit into it, which at the same time the priest invoked. He does not, however, any more than Theodulf, speak of the Holy Ghost as given to the candidates until after Baptism. He dwells upon the difference between the prayer of the presbyter in administering the baptismal Unction on the head, and that of the bishop in administering the Unction on the brow, or Imposition of the Hand.

"The priest (*sacerdos*) who anoints the novice, declares in the words of his prayer the loosing of bonds and the binding up of wounds, when he says, 'Almighty God, the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, Who hath regenerated thee by water and the Holy Ghost, and Who hath given unto thee the forgiveness of all sins'—in these words we perceive the curing of hurts, and the loosing of bonds; and then the priest adds, 'Himself anointeth thee with the chrism of salvation unto eternal life'—in these words we perceive a kind of putting in safety, which belongs to salvation even unto eternal life. But the bishop passes over the words, 'Himself anointeth thee with the chrism of salvation,' as being endowed with a richer power (*ditior*), and able not only to put in safety but also to enrich (*ditare*); and he says, 'Send forth upon him Thy holy sevenfold Spirit the Comforter from heaven, the Spirit of wisdom and understanding, the Spirit of counsel and might, the Spirit of knowledge and godliness; fill him with the Spirit of the fear of the Lord, and sign him with the sign of the cross, in mercy, unto eternal life.'"[1]

[1] *De Eccl. Off.* i. 27.

It is a curious fact that even when Baptism and Confirmation had come to be so far divided as they were by the middle of the ninth century, this Amalarius could still argue that a man who wilfully refuses to be confirmed after Baptism is in danger of being lost on the ground that our Lord had said, "Except a man be born again of water and the Holy Ghost, he cannot enter into the kingdom of God," adding that in Baptism we are truly forgiven our sins and are buried with Christ, but that it is through the Spirit that we are quickened to the new life.

"According to Matthew," Amalarius writes, "we are baptized in two ways with the Spirit. We are baptized with the Holy Ghost and with fire. We are baptized with the Holy Ghost when we are washed from sins, which washing is signified by clothing the whole body at Baptism in white raiment. We are baptized with fire when we receive the heat of the Spirit, as the Apostles did on the day of Pentecost. We receive the baptism of fire through the Laying on of the Hands of the bishops, to consume the 'wood, hay, stubble;' because God is a consuming fire, and offers the warmth of eternal life, and the light whereby to see things which are hidden from mortal eyes."

"I do not deny," he adds, "that a man may receive the Holy Ghost without the Laying on of the Hand, if the Lord chooses to bestow Him; but one who through negligence loses the Imposition of the Hand incurs a heavy censure, by the Apostolic practice, of which the Laying on of the Hand was a constant

exercise, and also by the discipline of the Church of to-day."

It is the indwelling of the living and personal Spirit which Amalarius teaches to be the great benefit of this rite, though, like some earlier writers, he thinks of the benefit as capable of being withdrawn and restored.

"The Holy Ghost is the guest of the mind of man. The less the mind is given up to carnal desires, the more amply it is satisfied by the abundance of the Holy Ghost. The recipient ought to observe the appointed seven days after the coming of the Holy Ghost in the same way as a dear friend does with a dear friend. When any one comes to a friend to whom he is dear, the one who entertains him will not in anything offend him; but whatever he knows that the other likes, he gets for him out of a kind heart. So, whatever the entertainer of the Holy Ghost knows that He likes, he should provide for Him as long as He is with him. If he does this, it may be that He will the sooner be won back to him, if for some offence He should withdraw. When the man who has been anointed recollects that the anointing Chrism is upon him, then he remembers that he ought specially to be under the discipline of the Holy Ghost." [1]

A still more distinguished disciple of Alcuin's has left us a similar account of the faith and practice of the Church of his day. Raban, called, for some unknown reason, in the playful language of Alcuin's literary circle, "the Moor," was Abbot of Fulda at the

[1] *De Eccl. Off.* i. 40.

time when he sent his book *On the Training of Clerks* (A.D. 819) to Haistulf, Archbishop of Mainz, to whose see he afterwards succeeded. In the first book of it, he discourses upon "the four gracious endowments (*charismatibus*) of the Church, that is, Baptism and Chrism, the Body and the Blood of Christ."[1]

"The first of the sacraments," says Raban, "is Baptism; because, before a man can be anointed with the holy Chrism, or be made partaker of the Body and Blood of Christ, he must be purified by sacred regeneration, and so come in due order to the rest. Baptism is not so called because the man is plunged in the water, but because he is there changed for the better by the Spirit of grace, and made something very different from what he was before."[2]

It is clear that, to Raban, regeneration was fully accomplished in Baptism itself. The subsequent blessings are then carefully enumerated.

"After the baptized person has come up out of the font," he says, "he is forthwith sealed upon the brain by the presbyter with the sacred Chrism, accompanied by a prayer that he may share the kingdom of Christ, and be able to be called, from Christ, a Christian. The anointing Chrism well follows upon Baptism, because the Holy Ghost, Who through that Chrism hallows believers by infusing His own power into them, descended in the form of a dove upon Jesus immediately after His Baptism. A type of this was shown in that dove, which at the Flood

[1] *De Cleric. Inst.* praef. [2] *Ibid.* i. 25.

brought back to the ark a sprig of olive with green leaves, signifying, surely, that the Holy Ghost through the anointing with Chrism in Baptism confers the greenness of heavenly grace upon the faithful."

He fortifies his position (as Amalarius of Metz does also [1]) by quoting a forged constitution of Silvester's, enjoining presbyters so to anoint, for fear the novice should die before having an opportunity of receiving Confirmation from the bishop. Because, "if any man have not the Spirit of Christ, he is none of His," and without being His no one can be partaker of His kingdom, "therefore," says Raban, "it is necessary that the baptized should at once have the succour of the anointing Chrism, in order that, receiving the participation of the Holy Ghost, he may not be a stranger to Christ." [2] Clearly Raban did not believe the Spirit to be given in Baptism proper, however much He may "change men for the better" there.

Raban next gives the rationale of the white raiment and the mystic headgear, in almost the words of Alcuin, and says distinctly, what is to be gathered both from Alcuin and also from Charles' articles of inquiry, that the newly baptized and anointed were at once "confirmed,"—or rather, as Raban prefers to put it, "every preceding sacrament is confirmed in them"—by the Body and Blood of the Lord. He speaks as if it had become the normal

[1] Only Amalarius is acute enough to observe that if Silvester made such a regulation, Innocent's subsequent decree was "superfluous."

[2] *De Cleric. Inst.* 28. The chrism with which the presbyter anoints is still, in Raban's time, made by the bishop.

thing for persons to be baptized without the bishop's presence, and to receive their first Communion at the same time; and then, with Alcuin's *nouissime*, he goes on to treat of the Imposition of the Hand of the bishop.

"Finally, the Holy Ghost, the Comforter, is transmitted to him by the chief priest through the Laying on of the Hand, that he may be fortified through the Holy Ghost to preach to others the gift which he has himself gained in Baptism, having been endowed through grace with eternal life. For the baptized is sealed with Chrism by the priest (*per sacerdotem*) on the top of the head, but by the pontiff on the brow, in order that by the former unction may be signified the descent of the Holy Ghost upon him to consecrate him for a habitation of God (*ad habitationem Deo consecrandam*), and in the second that the grace of the same sevenfold Spirit may be declared to come into the man (*uenire in hominem declaretur*) with all the fulness of sanctity and of knowledge and of power. For on the former occasion the Holy Ghost Himself, after bodies and souls are cleansed and blessed, willingly descends from the Father, to sanctify and enlighten by His visitation His own vessel; and on this latter occasion He comes into the man, with this intent, that the seal of faith, which he has accepted on his brow, may make him replete with heavenly gifts, and strengthened by His grace to bear the name of Christ fearlessly and boldly before kings and rulers of this world, and to preach it with a free voice. Nor is it strange that the man

should be twice anointed with the same Chrism for receiving the Holy Ghost, when the same Holy Ghost was given to the Apostles themselves twice over,—that is, once upon earth, when after His resurrection the Lord breathed upon them, and once from heaven, when, after the ascension of the Lord, He came upon the Apostles on the day of Pentecost in fiery tongues, and granted them to speak with the tongues of all nations."[1]

It is very remarkable how Raban, with all his strong teaching about regeneration in the act of Baptism, makes no kind of suggestion that the Holy Spirit is then given, or rather expressly excludes the thought by the reason which he gives for the earlier Unction; while he labours to explain why and in what different senses He is twice given in the two forms of Unction, of which the second is identified with the Laying on of the Hand. It will be observed that this able and learned scholar studiously refrains from connecting with the first of these Unctions the indwelling gift of the Holy Spirit. Somewhat after the manner of Optatus, he speaks of the Spirit in the first Unction as "consecrating" the habitation, as "sanctifying and enlightening by His visitation" the vessel which He has taken for His own; it is by the second that He "comes into the man." The prayers on the two occasions, to which Amalarius refers, make the distinction very plain.

It is worth while to refer, in conclusion, to the teaching of another famous pupil of the great Alcuin

[1] *De Cleric. Inst.* 30.

—Haymo, Bishop of the easternmost of the German sees founded by Charles the Great, at Halberstadt,—if it were only to compare and contrast it with the teaching of another whose work has become strangely mixed up with his.

A commentary upon the Pauline Epistles and the Epistle to the Hebrews was published by Gaigny in 1537 under the name of Primasius, Bishop of Hadrumetum, in North Africa in the sixth century. It has been convincingly shown by Haussleiter[1] that neither part of this commentary is from the hand of Primasius; but who was its author is still to be discovered. There is good reason to suppose the south of Gaul to be its birthplace; but the date (except that it is later than Cassiodorus, whom it quotes) is not certain. Remigius of Rheims, Remigius of Lyons, Remigius of Auxerre, have all been accredited with "this wandering composition," as Haussleiter calls it. Haymo, among whose works is found an exposition of the same books of Scripture, gives a different commentary on the Epistles of S. Paul; but when he comes to the Epistle to the Hebrews, he gives us the same commentary as the false Primasius, with scarcely more than verbal differences.

Now Remigius, or whoever passes under the name of Primasius, was a firm believer in the ancient doctrine of Confirmation as a part of Baptism. On 2 Cor. i. 23, he writes :—

"'And hath anointed us, is God.' With the Holy Ghost, or with the Chrism."

[1] In his and Zahn's *Forschungen zur Geschichte des neutest. Kanons*, part IV. (1891).

Here Haymo's note is fuller. We are anointed, he says, with the grace of the Holy Ghost,—that is, we have received remission of sins through the grace of the Holy Ghost. This somewhat meagre statement is then modified by remarking that whereas in the Old Testament priests and kings were anointed with visible oil, "in the New, all the faithful are anointed, not so much with visible oil, as with invisible grace, —the grace of the Holy Ghost in Baptism and through the Imposition of the Hand,—and they become kings of souls, and priests of peoples, that they may sanctify them."

Upon Eph. iv. 31, Remigius says:—

"'In whom ye were signed (*signati*).' Ye began to have a new sign (*signum*). 'On the day of redemption.' On the day of your Baptism ye received the seal (*signaculum*) of the Holy Ghost."

Haymo writes:—

"'In Whom'—that is, in Christ—'believing ye were signed'—that is, sealed or marked—'with the Holy Spirit of promise'—that is, through the Holy Ghost, Who was promised by the Lord to the Apostles, and through Whom we have the promise of life in Baptism. We are therefore marked as God's through the Holy Ghost Whom we received in Baptism,—because we recover in Baptism the seal of the likeness of God, which seal we lost by the sin of our first parent, namely innocence and holiness of soul."

On Heb. vi. 2, Remigius has:—

"'And of Laying on of Hands.' We ought not to lay the foundation again. He appeals to the Laying

on of Hands by which it is most fully believed that the gift of the Holy Ghost is received; which is wont to be done by the pontiffs after Baptism for the confirmation of unity in the Church."

These words (which are found also, with a slight modification, in Alcuin's commentary) reappear exactly in Haymo. But when we come to Heb. xiii. 25, we find a significant difference. There, the so-called Primasius gives us the most terse and exact statement of the doctrine of Confirmation (perhaps adopted from Origen) which is to be found in all patristic theology:—

"'Grace be with you all.' It is called grace because freely given. By the name of grace we must here understand a perfect faith, accompanied by good works; the remission of sins also, which the faithful receive at the time of Baptism; also the gift of the Holy Ghost, which is given in Baptism through Imposition of the Hand of the bishops; all which are freely given by God."

But, whether Haymo himself felt scrupulous about making this expression his own, or whether the scruple was felt by the scribes to whom we owe the text which goes by Haymo's name, the commentary ascribed to Haymo diverges much, and gives us what is plainly no casual various reading:—

"By the name of grace we must here understand . . . the remission of sins, which the elect receive at the time of Baptism; also the gift of the Holy Ghost, which is given as well in Baptism as through Imposition of the Hand of the bishops (*tam in baptismate quam per impositionem manus episcoporum*)."

The times have changed; and it is no longer natural for Haymo (or his scribe) to treat Confirmation as a part of Baptism, or to say that the Holy Ghost is given thereby, and not in Baptism also.

The elucidations of Raban, Haymo's fellow-scholar, make it tolerably clear that when Haymo thus speaks of the Holy Ghost as given "in Baptism," "in Baptism and through the Imposition of the Hand," "as well in Baptism as through Imposition of the Hand of the bishops," he would trace the baptismal bestowal of that gift to the Unction then given, and not to the immersion in the regenerating laver. That earlier Unction, as well as the later, was still, if I mistake not, performed with the bishop's chrism, and was itself, therefore, as strictly Confirmation as any now bestowed in the Oriental Church. But how long that restriction continued in force I am unable to say. At any rate, the separation between the bishop's Imposition of the Hand and Baptism had begun to be quite sharp. It could no longer be naturally spoken of as an actual factor in Baptism. The way was prepared for the baptismal Unction to subside into a place of no great importance, administered without reference to the bishop. Instead of the three sacramental acts, of Immersion, Unction, and Laying on of Hands, there were soon to be only two. Unction, divided between the two other acts, was destined to change the conception of them both. Attached to the baptismal washing, it became a mere ritual adjunct, while the virtues originally ascribed to it came to be ascribed to Baptism itself. Attached to the Laying

on of Hands, it supplanted the original mode of performing that rite, drawing to itself what spiritual value was still left to Confirmation after so large a part of it had been transferred to Baptism.

As we look back over the baptismal teaching of the Western Fathers of the first eight centuries and a half, there are some things which remain hazy, and some which stand out clear. The specific meaning of regeneration, for example, is somewhat hazy. Occasionally it seems to be no more than cleansing and forgiveness; sometimes it includes the participation of the Divine nature; now and then, it is even treated as if the long evolution of the Godlike character were contained in the title. It is no wonder, therefore, if there is some discrepancy among the Fathers about the way in which regeneration is conferred. By some, indeed by most, it is thought to be fully given in Baptism itself, so that, without Unction, or Laying on of the Hand, or the Seal, the believer may be said to come new-born out of the font. Others teach, by implication or expressly, that Baptism by itself conveys only what our Saviour calls the being "born of water;" and that the complementary rites which follow convey the "birth of the Spirit," without which a man is not yet fully born again. Once more, the Fathers often leave us uncertain how much value to attribute respectively to Unction and to Imposition of Hands,—or, which comes to the same thing, to the Unction of the head and of the brow. Not all are as explicit upon this point as Innocent I. or Raban and Amalarius of Metz.

But one thing may, I think, safely be said. No Western teacher down to the epoch of Charles the Great ever ascribes the gift of the Holy Ghost to Baptism in the restricted sense of that word. Jerome (in one of his many moods) appears to do so. Haymo appears to do so, in contexts where Baptism is contrasted with Imposition of Hands. But both of them are speaking of Baptisms which included the use of the Chrism; and the language of S. Jerome himself, and of those whose opinions Haymo shared, shew plainly the value which they attached to the Chrism. That there can be no Christian Baptism without the presence of the Holy Ghost,—that He bestows not only the blessings and graces proper to the laver but those also which lead a man to it,—is undoubted: and not all Christian teachers in the days of the Fathers, any more than now, cared to draw out the difference between earlier and later bounties of the Divine Spirit. Some shrank from using such language as that of Scripture, which says, "As yet there was no Spirit, because that Jesus was not yet glorified," or "As yet He was fallen upon none of them; they were only baptized;" because at first it looks as if such language attributed the more rudimentary operations of grace to some other agent. But such facts only make it the more remarkable that no instance is found in which a Western writer of those ages speaks of the Holy Ghost as bestowed by means of Baptism itself, while they so steadily and consistently teach that He is bestowed by means of Unction and Laying on of Hands. This cannot be

an accident. It was, in fact, not easy for a man to go wrong about the doctrine if he was in the habit of using prayers and rites such as are contained in the Gelasian Sacramentary and the *Ordo Romanus*,[1] dating back, in the main, to at least the fourth century. Even what seem, perhaps, subtle distinctions in Amalarius and Raban between the two Unctions become manifest in the light of those prayers. Whatever blessings were expected in the font, and in the anointing which succeeded it, it was only in the Laying on of Hands, accompanied by the sealing of the brow, that men were taught to look for the coming and the indwelling of the Holy Ghost, the Comforter, the sevenfold Spirit of God.

[1] See the Appendix which follows.

APPENDIX I.

ANCIENT WESTERN BAPTISMAL PRAYERS.

The *lex orandi* shews, more convincingly than extracts from the writings of individual teachers can, what were the feelings of the Church in general with regard to the sacred ceremonies. We have already seen Amalarius of Metz quoting from the *Ordo Romanus* (which, under Pipin and Charles, came to be widely used throughout the West) the prayers offered at the Baptismal Unction and at the Laying on of Hands respectively, and commenting on the significant difference between them. That these two prayers were of far higher antiquity than the time of Amalarius cannot be doubted. The former of them, as we have seen, is found in the *De Sacramentis*, which there is no reason to think is not by S. Ambrose. In the same work is found the substance of the second. From the way in which Sirice, the contemporary of Ambrose, speaks of the *septiformis Spiritus* in his letter to Himerius, and from the way in which Innocent, in his letter to Decentius, speaks of the *Paracletus Spiritus*, it seems probable that those prelates themselves used the very words of the second prayer in administering Confirmation. We may with some confidence suppose that the same holds good of other prayers in the *Ordo Romanus* and in the Gelasian Sacramentary.

The Gelasian Sacramentary and the earliest known form of the *Ordo Romanus* (which is the book of rubrics or directions to accompany the Sacramentary) are to be most conveniently found in Muratori's *Vetus Liturgia Romana*. A later form of the *Ordo*, put together from several sources, is given by Hittorp in his collection *De Divinis Catholicae Ecclesiae Officiis*. Parts of the ancient Sacramentaries bearing on the subject are also printed in Martène *De Antiquis Ecclesiae Ritibus*, vol. i., and also in Asseman's *Codex Liturgicus*, vols. i.–iii., with a good many variations from the form given subsequently by Muratori; these variations, however, have no doctrinal significance.

According to the Gelasian Sacramentary, the catechumens were to be exorcized in the third week of Lent. In one of the forms of exorcism come these words, addressed to the evil spirit—

"Give honour, therefore, to the coming of the Holy Spirit (*aduenienti Spiritui sancto*), Who descendeth from the height of heaven to confound thy frauds, and to perfect the breasts which have been purged by the sacred font and consecrated, by making them a temple and a dwelling-place for God (*qui . . . diuino fonte purgata pectora, id est sanctificata, Deo templum et habitaculum perficiat*)."[1]

After this, their ears were "opened," and words from the four Gospels were read to them. They were then supposed to have been "conceived" by their mother the Church—

"In order that when the revered day of Easter comes, you, being born again (*renascentes*) by the laver of Baptism, may, like all the saints, be found worthy to receive from our Lord Christ the honour of being Infants and Faithful (*fidele munus infantiae*)."[2]

On the morning of Easter Eve, they were "catechized,"

[1] Murat. p. 536. [2] *Ibid.* p. 539.

i.e. questioned about the renunciation of Satan, and the evil spirit was thus again addressed:—

"I command thee to come out and depart from this servant of God, whom to-day our Lord God Jesus Christ of His bounty (*dono*) hath vouchsafed to call to His holy grace and benediction, and to the font of Baptism; that he may be made His temple through the water of regeneration for remission of all sins."[1]

The prayers at the consecration of the font were as follows:—

"Almighty, everlasting God, be present to the mysteries of Thy great lovingkindness; be present to the sacraments; and for the creation of the new multitudes whom the font of Baptism brings forth unto Thee, send out the Spirit of adoption (*ad creandos nouos populos, quos tibi fons baptismatis parturit, spiritum adoptionis emitte*); and grant that that which is to be done by our humble ministry may be completed by Thy effectual power; through."[2]

"O God, Who by Thy invisible power dost marvellously work the effect of Thine own sacraments, and although we be unworthy to perform so great mysteries, yet Thou forsakest not the gifts of Thine own grace, incline the ears of Thy lovingkindness even unto our prayers: O God, Whose Spirit moved upon the face of the waters in the very beginning of the world, that even then the nature of waters might conceive a sanctifying virtue: O God, Who cleansing by means of waters the crimes of the guilty world, didst mark the symbol of regeneration by pouring forth the deluge, in order that one and the same element might mystically be both the end of vices and the beginning of virtues; Look, O Lord, upon the face of Thy Church, and multiply in her Thy generations,[3] Who dost make glad Thy city by the rivers

[1] Murat. p. 563.

[2] *Ibid.* p. 568. The words are a reference to Ps. ciii. (civ.) 30.

[3] For *generationes*, Hittorp's *Ordo* has *regenerationes*. It is a sign

of the flood of Thy grace, and dost open a fountain of Baptism[1] in all the world for the renewal of the nations, that by the command of Thy majesty it may acquire the grace of Thy Only Begotten from the Holy Spirit; by Whom we pray that this water prepared for the regeneration of men may be impregnated (*fecundet*) by the secret admixture of His light; that it conceiving sanctification, there may emerge from the immaculate womb of the sacred font a heavenly offspring, born again a new creature, and that those of differing sex and age may all be brought forth by the motherhood of grace into one and the same Infancy. . . . May this holy and innocent creature of Thine be free from all invasion of the assailant, and purified by the departure of all wickedness. Let it be a living font, a regenerating water,[2] a purifying wave, that all who are to be washed in this saving laver may by the operation of the Holy Ghost upon them (*in eis*) obtain the favour of perfect purification."[3]

After one or two benedictions of the water comes the following:—

"Be Thou, Almighty God, mercifully present to us who observe Thy commandments, and in favourable kindness breathe upon us. Bless Thou these simple waters with Thine own mouth, that besides the natural cleansing which they can give to the bodies that are washed in them, they may be effectual also for the purifying of minds."

of the antiquity of the prayer, which borrows from Ps. lxiv. (lxv.) 11, where the Vulgate (Jerome's revision of the Old Gallican) has *genimina*. The reading *generationes* is found in the version given by S. Hilary of Poitiers, though in his comments he uses *genimina*. Probably by the time of the *Ordo* the reference to the Psalm was lost, through the use of the newer text, and so the word was altered to *regenerationes*.

[1] Zech. xiii. 1.

[2] *Aquae* is probably a slip for *aqua*, as *perfecti* below for *perfectae*.

[3] Assem. ii. pp. 2, 3; Hittorp, p. 81.

"May the virtue of Thy Spirit descend into this fulness of the font, and impregnate (*fecundet*) this whole substance of water with effectual regeneration. Here may all stains of sins be blotted out. Here may the nature created after Thine image, and reformed after its glorious original, be cleansed from all filth of old time, that every man who enters upon this sacrament of regeneration may be born again into the new Infancy of true innocence; through our Lord Jesus Christ Thy Son, Who shall come in the Holy Ghost to judge the quick and the dead and the world by fire."[1]

The *Ordo* here adds the ceremony of pouring Chrism upon the water with the words (according to Hittorp's form), "May this font be hallowed and impregnated (*fecundetur*) to those who are born again of it unto eternal life." The Sacramentary proceeds immediately to the act of Baptism.

There is here no sign of an expectation that the baptized will receive the Holy Ghost by the sacramental immersion. Very strong language is used about the descent of the Holy Ghost upon the water, but nothing is said about His descent upon the candidates. It is expected that they will be cleansed from sin, born again to a new childhood, a new creation, a heavenly offspring; that they will receive grace and benediction; that they will be made God's temple through the water of regeneration. All this will be effected by the operation of the Holy Ghost, the sending forth of the Spirit of adoption; but there is nothing similar even to our own English invocation—with the careful words of which I would not for a moment seem to find fault—"Give Thy Holy Spirit to this infant that he may be born again."

We turn next to the prayers at the consecration of the various Chrisms. This consecration took place annually on Maundy Thursday. The Mass on that day is called in

[1] Assem. ii. p. 4; Hittorp, pp. 81, 82.

the Sacramentary the *Missa Chrismalis.* First came the exorcism and benediction of the oil for the unction of the sick and the possessed, immediately after the prayer of consecration of the Eucharist.

"I exorcize thee, foul spirit, and every invasion of Satan, and every phantom, in the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Ghost, that thou depart from this oil, that it may be made a spiritual unction, for the strengthening (*corroborandum*) of the temple of the living God, that the Holy Spirit may be able to dwell in it, through the name of God the Father Almighty, and through the name of His beloved Son our Lord Jesus Christ."[1]

"Send out, O Lord, Thy Spirit the Comforter from heaven upon this fatness of the olive, which Thou hast vouchsafed to produce from the green tree for the refreshment of mind and body; and let Thy holy benediction be to all who anoint with it, taste it, or touch it, a protection of body, soul, and spirit, for the casting out of all pains, of all infirmities, and of all sickness of mind and body. Let Thy Chrism, wherewith Thou didst anoint priests, kings, prophets, and martyrs, be perfected by Thee, O Lord, and blessed, abiding in our inmost parts, in the name of our Lord Jesus Christ."[2]

Then, after the bishop had given the customary blessings and had received his Communion, began with great solemnity the consecration of what the *Ordo* calls "the principal Chrism."

The bishop, mixing the balsam with the oil, prayed thus:—

"Let us pray our Lord Almighty, Who by a wonderful ordering hath joined inseparably the incomprehensible Divinity of His only begotten and coeternal Son with true manhood, and by the co-operation of the grace of the Holy Spirit anointed Him with the oil of gladness above

[1] Hittorp. [2] Murat. p. 555.

His fellows, in order that man, who was ruined by the fraud of the devil, consisting of two materials in one (*gemina et singulari materia*), might be restored to the eternal inheritance from which he was fallen: that He would bless with the perfectness of the Holy Trinity these created liquids of diverse nature, and by blessing sanctify them, and grant that being mixed together they may be made one, and that whosoever shall therewith be outwardly anointed, may be so oiled inwardly, that being rid of all defilement of the material body he may rejoice to be made partaker of the heavenly kingdom; through the same our Lord."

"May this mixing of the liquids be made to all that are anointed a propitiation and a saving preservation for ever and ever."

Then the oil was exorcized:—

"I exorcize thee, O creature of oil, through God the Father Almighty, Who made heaven and earth, the sea and all things therein, that every power of the adversary, all the host of the devil, and every invasion and every phantom of Satan may be plucked out and driven away from thee, that thou mayest be to all, who shall be anointed with thee, unto the adoption of sons through the Holy Ghost, in the name of God the Father Almighty, and in the love of Jesus Christ His Son our Lord, Who with Him liveth and reigneth, God, in the unity of the same Holy Spirit for ever and ever."

Then follows—

"The Lord be with you."	"And with thy spirit."
"Lift up your hearts."	"We lift them up unto the Lord."
"Let us give thanks unto our Lord God."	"It is meet and right so to do."

"It is very meet and right, and fitting and wholesome, that we should at all times and in all places give thanks unto Thee, O Lord, Holy Father, Almighty, Everlasting

God; Who in the beginning, amidst the other gifts of Thy bounty, didst command the earth to bring forth trees bearing fruit, amongst which should spring up the olives which minister this rich liquid, whose fruit should serve for the sacred Chrism. For David also, knowing afore the sacraments of Thy grace by the Spirit of prophecy, sang that our countenances should be made cheerful with oil. And when of old the crimes of the world were discharged by the outpouring of the deluge, the dove, setting forth a likeness of the gift that was to come, announced by an olive branch that peace was restored to the earth. Which in these last days is declared by most effectual proofs, when, all the crimes which we have committed being wiped out by the waters of Baptism, this Unction of oil makes our countenances joyful and calm. For this cause also Thou gavest commandment also to Thy servant Moses, that after his brother Aaron had been washed with water he should make him priest by pouring this ointment upon him. Greater honour than this was bestowed, moreover, when Thy Son Jesus Christ our Lord had demanded to be washed of John with the waves of Jordan, by Thy sending Thy Holy Spirit from above in the likeness of a dove, and shewing, by the testimony of the voice that followed after, Thine Only Begotten, in Whom Thou wast well pleased, and thus making it most plain and evident that this was the meaning of the prophet David when he sang that He should be anointed with the oil of gladness above His fellows. We therefore pray Thee, O Lord, Holy Father, Almighty, Everlasting God, by the same Jesus Christ Thy Son our Lord, that Thou wouldest vouchsafe to sanctify with Thy benediction the richness of this Thy creature, and to mingle therewith the virtue of Thy Holy Spirit, with the co-operation of the power of Thy Christ, from Whose holy name the Chrism hath taken its name, wherewith Thou didst anoint priests and kings, prophets and martyrs; that to them which shall be renewed by the

Baptism of the spiritual washing Thou mayest confirm the creature of Chrism to be a sacrament of perfect salvation and life; so that the sanctifying Unction being poured upon them, and the corruption of their first nativity being swallowed up, the holy temple of every one of them may give forth the innocent odour of an acceptable life; that according to the sacrament of Thine appointment, they, having poured upon them the royal and priestly and prophetic dignity, may be clothed with the garment of the incorruptible gift; that it may be to those who shall be born again of water and the Holy Ghost, a Chrism of salvation, and that Thou mayest make them partakers of eternal life, and sharers of the heavenly glory; through."

After this followed the exorcism and consecration of the oil for the unction of catechumens, preliminary to Baptism.

"I exorcize thee, O creature of oil . . . that this unction may be purified by the Divine sacraments for adoption of flesh and spirit to those who are to be anointed therewith for the remission of all sins; that their bodies may be made hallowed for the receiving of all grace; through."

"O God, the bountiful Giver of all spiritual increase and advancement, Who confirmest by the virtue of Thy Holy Spirit the first beginnings of weak minds, we pray Thee, O Lord, that Thou wouldest bestow upon those who are about to come to the laver of blessed regeneration, by means of anointing with this creature of Thine, the purifying of mind and body, that if any stains of spirits that war against them have cleaved to them, they may be removed by the touch of this consecrated oil. Let there be no place for spiritual wickednesses, no opportunity for rebel powers; let no chance of lurking be left to evils that lie in ambush; but let the preparation of this unction be to Thy servants who come to the faith, and are about to be cleansed by the operation of Thy Holy Spirit, useful

unto salvation, which they are about to obtain by the birth of heavenly regeneration in the sacrament of Baptism; through our Lord Jesus Christ Thy Son, Who shall come to judge the quick and the dead and the world by fire."[1]

The corresponding prayers in the "Ambrosian" ritual of Milan, as given in Hittorp's *Ordo*, were as follows.

Benediction of the oil for anointing the sick and the energumens:—

"O Lord, Who in Thy care for the health of man hast imparted to Thy creatures the power of blessing, in order that for the use of the sanctifying of our souls, health in our times should be bestowed by the ministry even of bodily things, pour Thy sanctification upon this oil, that from the members therewith anointed, all snares of the adversary's power being put to flight, by the receiving of this present oil the healthful grace of the Holy Spirit may expel sickness and confer full recovery, in the name."

For the anointing of the catechumens:—

"O God, the Designer and Ordainer of this sacrament, Who by the richness of this present liquid hast confirmed the bodies of the blessed and the hearts of high priests, and Who hast imparted to them by this Thy creature the nobility of that excellent name, that Thou shouldest make them Christs; Who hast commanded the bishops, shining and running over therewith, to be preferred before their

[1] In this part I have followed Hittorp's *Ordo*, which is clearer than the Sacramentary. The Sacramentary, after the consecration of the oil for the sick, and the completion of the Canon of the Mass, proceeds to the prayer given above as for the oil of the Catechumens, beginning, "O God, the bountiful Giver." Then comes the salutation and *Sursum*, with the Thanksgiving following; and after that, the heading, "Also the Making of the Exorcised Oil." The balsam is here mixed with the oil; and the exorcism given above as for the "principal Chrism" then follows, with some additions, and an unfinished fragment of a collect.

fellows, deeming it a worthy element whereby to bestow the pattern of innocence and of divers virtues; may it please Thee by the infusion of the Holy Spirit to confirm and ennoble the substance of this present oil, long since pleasing unto Thee, that whatsoever in human kind shall be touched therewith, may be soon changed to a nature from above, nor let the ancient enemy claim for himself anything through the unction thereof, but see himself with sorrow made over to the darts of this blessed munition, and groan to find the pride of his old rage restrained by the oil of peace; through Christ our Lord."

The "Preface of the Chrism:"—

"With one heart and mind, beloved brethren, let us implore the merciful aid of God the Father Almighty, that this ointment, wherewith His people is to be robed in royal glory, may be by Him fortified with heavenly benediction and the force of His own power, and by the protection thereof His subjects may be kept for ever blessed, by grace of our Lord Jesus Christ, Who."

The prayer "for completing the benediction of the Chrism" defies translation:—

"O Sovereign Lord God, the anointed King, Author of the ointment, beauteous in Thy form, and more beauteous by reason of Thine unction, Who wast Thine own consecrator, and art the consecrator of all; Who of Thy power sanctifiest the ointment, and of Thine ointment consecratest power; Who of the ointment hast made a Chrism, and of the Chrism the name which is above every name, that in that name Christians may have a royal unction; in Thy name therefore let this Thy creature be now made a Chrism, and be used as a Chrism, the sign of the Cross, the mark of the brow, the token of a sacred warrior. By this Chrism may the hearing be soothed, sight purified, smelling be sweet, taste made savoury, touch be firm in the Trinity; that the soldiers of the Lord, being adorned with such pay, and moistened with ambrosial dew, may

obey Thy command, not Thy persuasion, and being signed (*signati*) with the holy Chrism may be found meet to be heavenly standard-bearers (*signiferi*); through Thee, Christ Jesu, Saviour of the world, Who livest and reignest God for ever and ever. Amen."

These prayers leave us in considerable uncertainty after all, what blessings in particular were supposed to be conveyed by means of the "principal Chrism" To be "inwardly oiled" (*liniri*) in such a way as to be rid of material defilements; to be made a joyful partaker of the heavenly kingdom; to find in the Chrism a "propitiation and a saving preservation for ever," and "the adoption of sons;" to have the countenance made cheerful thereby, and be anointed with the oil of gladness; to receive the grace which makes men kings and priests, prophets and martyrs; perfect salvation and life, the fragrance of a good conversation, fortification and protection;—these are the blessings attached to the use of the Chrism. These are not very determinate and tangible things to ask for —the benefits of a well-used sacrament, rather than a special gift—and it seems to be unmistakably clear that in the first instance the use of Unction was rather symbolical than sacramental.

This impression is strengthened when we see the like indeterminateness in the words with which the Unction was applied. They have already been given from S. Ambrose and from Amalarius. Upon coming up out of the font, the "Infant" was anointed, "on the brain," according to the Sacramentary, by the presbyter, with the words—

"Almighty God, the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, Who hath regenerated thee of water and the Holy Ghost, and Who hath given unto thee forgiveness of all sins, Himself anointeth" (or, according to another reading, "anoint") "thee with the Chrism of salvation in Christ Jesu our Lord unto eternal life. Amen."

There is nothing more sacramental in the language concerning the "principal Chrism" than in that concerning the other unctions. The oil of catechumens was, according to the prayers, to contribute to adoption, to remission of all sins, to hallowing the body in preparation for all grace, to purifying of mind and body, to change of nature, and defeat of all spiritual enemies. The oil of the sick, which came to be regarded as a separate sacrament, is more definitely described as serving for the "strengthening of the temple of the living God (*i.e.* the body), that the Holy Ghost may be able to dwell in it," and for "the casting out of all pains and of all infirmity, and of all sickness of mind and body." At the same time, its original connexion with the baptismal unction is indicated by the mention, in the prayer of consecration, of the anointing of priests, kings, prophets, and martyrs. It was really the same thing applied for a special purpose.

The full force and significance of this hazy indefiniteness about the Chrism will now be felt when we pass to the act by which the Baptism was completed. The *Ordo Romanus* gives the following direction: "The pontiff, coming to the Infants, while the archdeacon holds the Chrism, his shoulders and arms wrapped in linen cloth, his hands raised and imposed over the heads of them all, shall offer prayer over them, with invocation of the sevenfold grace of the Holy Spirit." A shorter and more ancient rubric is given by Muratori from the Gelasian Sacramentary:—

"Then the sevenfold Spirit is given to them by the bishop; to seal them (*ad consignandum*) he lays his hand upon them in these words:

"Almighty God, the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, Who hast regenerated Thy servants of water and the Holy Ghost, and Who hast given unto them forgiveness of all sins; do Thou, O Lord, send upon them (*in eos*) Thy

Holy Ghost the Comforter; and give them the Spirit of wisdom and understanding, the Spirit of counsel and might, the Spirit of knowledge and godliness; fill them with the Spirit of the fear of God, in the name of our Lord Jesus Christ, with Whom Thou livest and reignest, God for ever, with the Holy Ghost, world without end. Amen.

"Afterwards he seals (*signat*) them on the forehead with the Chrism, saying—

"The seal of Christ unto eternal life. Amen."

Hittorp's *Ordo Romanus*, following the Gregorian Sacramentary,[1] has the prayer in a slightly different form, as we have seen it quoted by Amalarius, except that Amalarius gives it in the singular, as if said over each one separately, while the *Ordo* gives it in the plural. It includes the word *septiformis*:—

"Almighty, Everlasting God, Who hast vouchsafed to regenerate these Thy servants and Thy handmaidens of water and the Holy Ghost, and Who hast given unto them forgiveness of all sins, send forth upon them Thy holy sevenfold Spirit the Comforter from heaven. Amen. The Spirit of wisdom and understanding. Amen. The Spirit of counsel and might. Amen. The Spirit of knowledge and godliness. Amen. Fill them with the Spirit of Thy fear. Amen. And seal them with the seal of the Cross of Christ, in mercy, unto eternal life; through. Amen.

"The prayer ended, the deacons asking the names of all, one by one, the pontiff, dipping his thumb in the Chrism, shall make a cross upon the forehead of each, saying thus:—

"I confirm thee in the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Ghost. Amen.

"Peace be with thee. And with thy spirit.

"Again, when all are confirmed, he says these verses:—

[1] Murat. vol. ii. p. 65.

"Lo, thus shall the man be blessed that feareth the Lord. The Lord bless you out of Sion, that ye may see Jerusalem in prosperity all the days of your life. The Lord keep you in His most holy fear; Who liveth.

"Peace be with you. And with thy spirit.

"God, Who gavest to Thy Apostles the Holy Ghost, and through them and their successors didst will that He should be transmitted to the rest of the faithful, look favourably upon our humble service, and grant that the same Holy Ghost, coming to the hearts of them whose brows we have anointed with the sacred Chrism and sealed with the seal of the Cross, may by His gracious indwelling perfect them into a temple of His glory; through: in the unity of the same Holy Spirit."

We have no African Sacramentary left to us; nor is it likely to have presented any marked divergence of doctrine from the Roman. The Gallican and other Western forms known to us are precisely similar in tone. The Gothic Missal seems to recall the words of Tertullian[1] when it asks for the descent of the Angel upon the water of Baptism; but the Angel appears to be afterwards identified with the Comforter Spirit.[1]

[1] Murat. vol. ii. pp. 590, 591.

CHAPTER IV.

THE CHURCH OF ALEXANDRIA.

THE Church of Alexandria stands in much the same kind of relation to the Eastern Church at large as the African Church does to that of the West. On the special doctrine of which we are treating it is not to be expected that Alexandria will offer any very distinctive type of expression; but there seem to have been points, even in this limited department of theology, in which the tone of that most remarkable Church varied from the tone of its Greek neighbours. In particular, it would appear that at Alexandria the Laying on of Hands, as distinguished from the Chrism, continued to be a living rite, and associated with a very vigorous doctrine, at a time when it was practically lost to sight in other parts of the East.

A fitting introduction to the witness of the known divines of that Church will be found in a work whose authorship is involved in a cloud of uncertainties. This is the ancient manual, first brought before the modern public by Dr. Tattam, Archdeacon of Bedford, in 1848, under the title of *The Apostolic*

Constitutions or Canons of the Apostles in Coptic. Dr. Tattam's manuscript was only written in the year "1520 of Diocletian," *i.e.* A.D. 1804; but its contents are a translation by the scribe himself from the Thebaic dialect of Upper Egypt, into that of Lower Egypt or Memphitic. Dr. Tattam possessed a copy also, though an incomplete copy, of the Thebaic original; and Bishop Lightfoot[1] has given an account of a fuller Thebaic manuscript of the same preserved in the British Museum. This fuller manuscript has now been printed at length by Lagarde,[2] and a careful translation of it into German has been published by Achelis in Gebhardt and Harnack's *Texte und Untersuchungen* (bd. VI. hft. 4).[3] The Canons are, no doubt, translated from a Greek original; and there is no question that they emanate from a genuinely Alexandrian source.

The Church of Alexandia was always distinguished for the pains which it took in the preparation of its candidates for Holy Baptism. No other Christian community could boast of anything like its Catechetical School. Quite in keeping with this special glory of the Egyptian Church, the Egyptian Constitutions go very fully into the discipline of the postulants for admission to the Christian fold. A catechumenate of three years is prescribed before Baptism—though an abridgement of the time is

[1] *S. Clement of Rome* (First Edition) App. 273, 466.

[2] *Aegyptiaca* p. 207 (Göttingae, 1883.)

[3] Lagarde's own translation of the Coptic Canons into Greek (but not from the MS. described by Bishop Lightfoot) is to be found in Bunsen's *Analecta Antenicaena* vol. ii. pp. 461, foll.

permitted in cases of exceptional fitness. The master of the catechumens (as we know to have been the case at Alexandria) might be either an ecclesiastic or a layman. When the day of Baptism approached, the bishop was bidden to administer to the candidates a preliminary "exorcism, that he might know that they were pure." Those who stood this test and were accepted as candidates for Baptism were to fast on the "preparation of the Sabbath," the Friday—presumably before Easter. The Sabbath following they spent on their knees, in common prayers, amidst which they were again exorcized by the bishop, with imposition of the hand, and sealing of the brow, and of the ears, and of the mouth. This done, the bishop raised them from their knees, and they spent the whole night watching, and listening to readings and exhortations.

As soon as the cock crew, the water was turned on or poured into the font, and prayers were offered over it. Then follow these directions:—

"And at the time appointed for the Baptism, let the bishop give thanks over the oil which, putting into a vessel, he shall call the oil of Thanksgiving. Again he shall take another oil, and exorcizing over it, he shall call it the oil of Exorcism. And a deacon shall bear the oil of Exorcism, and stand on the left hand of the presbyter.[1] Another deacon shall take

[1] The name of presbyter continued for a long time in Egypt to be specially given to the bishop. Therefore perhaps the presbyter is here the same person who has just been called the bishop; but it seems quite as likely that the bishop was not present at the actual Baptism, but awaited the newly baptized in the church.

the oil of Thanksgiving, and stand on the right hand of the presbyter. And when the presbyter has taken hold of each one of those who are about to receive Baptism, let him command him to renounce, saying, 'I will renounce thee, Satan, and all thy service, and all thy works.' And when he has renounced all these, let him anoint him with the oil of Exorcism, saying, 'Let every spirit depart from thee.'"

They were then thrice dipped in the water, the children first, then the grown-men, and then the women, the deacon going down with them into the water and repeating before them the words in which they were required to confess their faith. After the immersion, each was again questioned about his belief.

"Let him again say, 'I believe.' And let them go up out of the water; and the presbyter shall anoint him with the oil of Thanksgiving, saying, 'I anoint thee with holy anointing oil, in the name of Jesus Christ.' Thus he shall anoint every one of the rest, and clothe them, and they shall enter into the church."

As soon as they were come into the church, followed their full Confirmation.

"Let the bishop lay his hand upon them with yearning, saying, 'Lord God, as Thou hast made these worthy to receive the forgiveness of their sins unto the coming world, make them worthy to be filled with Thy Holy Spirit, and send down upon them Thy grace, that they may serve Thee according to Thy will; for Thine is the glory,—the Father, and the Son, and the Holy Spirit,—in the holy Church, now and always, and for ever and ever.' And he shall pour

of the oil of Thanksgiving in his hand, and put his hand upon his head, saying, 'I anoint thee with the holy anointing oil, through God the Father Almighty, and Jesus Christ, and the Holy Spirit.' And he shall seal upon his forehead, kissing him on the mouth, and he shall say, 'The Lord be with thee.' He who hath been sealed shall answer, 'And with thy spirit,' each one doing thus with the remaining. And let all the people pray together. And all those who receive Baptism shall be praying: let them say peace with their mouths."[1]

A careful examination of this most interesting set of regulations shews how nearly akin the baptismal doctrine of the early Alexandrian Church was to that of the Church which least resembled it in general character, the African Church of Tertullian's time. All the ceremonies described form parts of one undivided sacrament,—the triple immersion, the anointings, the laying on of the hand, and the sign upon the brow; but they are not confused together in one spiritual effect. Of these rites, the first,—as is shewn by the bishop's subsequent prayer,—conveys "the forgiveness of sins in the coming world." The second—the Oil of Thanksgiving,—occupies, as in Tertullian, a position doctrinally obscure. Whether as administered by the "presbyter" immediately after Baptism, or as administered by the bishop after the Laying on of Hands,—the second time upon the forehead, the first time we may suppose, from the absence of special directions, upon the head,—this unction

[1] Tattam *Apostolical Constitutions* pp. 48–62; Achelis *l.c.* pp. 92–99.

appears to be scarcely regarded as a vehicle of grace, but rather as a symbol of rejoicing in the gifts already given by the other two rites respectively. It may also be concluded that the name by which this oil is described in the formula of unction, "holy anointing oil," implicitly involves the doctrine of Tertullian that the persons anointed are thereby consecrated priests.[1] But the prayer at the Laying on of the Hand, with its clear recognition of forgiveness already bestowed,—nay, even recalling Tertullian's silence about regeneration in the baptismal waters,—is just such as Tertullian describes,—"with blessing invoking and inviting the Holy Ghost." Its language has not yet, indeed, reached the full explicitness of the formula of S. Ambrose. The doctrine of the Holy Ghost was as yet altogether undeveloped. But the prayer—so like in structure to the later Western prayer as to suggest an exceedingly early common source for both—implies distinctly that the baptized have "not obtained the Holy Spirit in the waters." It prays that they may be "filled" with Him, and that the gift may fit them for faithful service in the world.

If the date of these Constitutions is as early as I believe that we are right in supposing it to be, they bring much light to the interpretation of phrases which we find scattered up and down in the writings of S. Clement of Alexandria. S. Clement,[2] the pupil and

[1] See Exodus xxx. 25, 30, 31. It is even noticeable in this connexion that Tertullian makes no reference to kingship as bestowed by the baptismal Unction; see above, p. 60. Achelis, however, gives no separate word to represent "*anointing* oil."

[2] So we may continue to call him, although Benedict XIV. struck him off the list.

successor of Pantaenus (who was the earliest known master of the Catechetical School in that city), was contemporary with Tertullian, being born not long after the year 150. Amongst his earlier teachers was a certain "Ionian," whom Bishop Lightfoot is inclined to identify with the famous Melito of Sardis, the first author known to have written upon Holy Baptism.[1] From this Ionian he must have derived the story of S. John and the young robber, in which we are told that the bishop to whom the young man was entrusted by the Apostle,

"Nourished him, kept him in, fostered him, at last enlightened him. And after this, he withdrew from further care and guardianship of him, as having set upon him the perfect safeguard, the seal of the Lord."[2]

It cannot with any certainty be affirmed that the "seal" here spoken of means absolutely and only the application of the anointing oil to the forehead, of which the Constitutions make mention. Rather, it appears to gather up what has just been called the young man's "enlightenment." That the "enlightenment" is a synonym for Baptism there can be no doubt. But if the Constitutions describe a discipline with which Clement was familiar, there can be as little doubt that the title of the "seal," as applied to Baptism, meant, to him, Baptism culminating in that special act, and perfected by it. Baptism as a whole may be the seal, but usually, at least, it is in virtue of its concluding ceremony that it bears that name.[3]

[1] *Essays on Supernat. Religion* p. 224.

[2] *Quis Dives* 42 (p. 959 Potter).

[3] But see above, p. 54.

That the seal sometimes, at least, meant for Clement an action distinct from Baptism, is clear from the complaint which he makes against the Basilidean doctrine which reduced man to an animal, acting automatically upon an external stimulus. Repentance and faith, he says, are thus abolished, and we are left "without reason either for Baptism, or for the blessed Seal (*οὐδὲ βάπτισμα ἔτι εὔλογον, οὐδὲ μακαρία σφραγίς*)."[1]

There is also a striking passage in his *Selections from the Prophets*, where Clement appears distinctly to separate the "seal" from the baptismal washing, assigning to it a very different spiritual potency. We cannot say for certain how the fragments which compose that collection were originally connected together, but this section occurs in close juxtaposition with others which speak of Baptism and the cleansing which it gives. "It is not enough," says S. Clement, "only to empty out the soul; it must be filled with God. It is no longer bad, because it has ceased (from sin); but neither is it yet good, because it has not yet received (that which is needed to make it good). But a thing which is neither good nor bad, is nothing. Back comes into the cleansed and empty house, if nothing saving is put in, the unclean spirit which dwelt therein before, taking with him other seven unclean spirits. Therefore, when we have emptied the soul of evil things, we must fill it with that (or 'with Him') which is good, and it is a chosen habita-

[1] *Strom.* ii. 5 (p. 434 Potter). See the elaborate argument drawn from this passage by Friedhoff *Katholische Dogmatik* p. 900.

tion. For when the empty places are filled, then follows the Seal, that that which is holy may be kept for God."[1]

Though Clement is perhaps speaking more of the sacred things themselves than of the sacraments of the things, yet evidently it is his doctrine that while Baptism itself is the purification of the soul, which fits it for a Divine habitation, it is by some subsequent act immediately followed by the Seal, that the Holy Spirit comes personally to occupy His new domicile. What was that subsequent act which "fills the empty places," and is at once made inviolable by the Seal? Judging by the Constitutions, we should unhesitatingly say that it was the Laying on of the bishop's Hands.

If it should still be argued that the "Seal of the Lord," in the story of the young robber, is intended to be synonymous with "enlightenment," it will be worth while to examine the meaning which Clement attaches to this latter term. The term "enlightenment" itself involves more than the sacramental immersion. It must be supposed, in the first instance, to denote the initiation into the Christian faith on its intellectual and doctrinal side. As such, the term (which first appears in this sense in the Epistle to the Hebrews) was one which well suited the genius of the Alexandrian Church and its chief catechist. Clement characteristically dwells more upon the power of truth than upon the power of grace—upon the conscious and moral side

[1] *Proph. Eclog.* § 12.

of the Christian privilege than upon those underlying facts of life which baffle analysis. Accordingly he interprets the baptismal "enlightenment" as the communication of perfect knowledge, combating the Gnostic notion that Baptism is but an admission to a low degree of spiritual attainment, and that further initiations are necessary before the soul can rise to its maturity.

"We are not," he says, "addressed as 'children' and 'infants' with reference to the childishness and contemptible nature of our learning, as is slanderously said by those who are puffed up with their knowledge. Directly upon being born again, we have received that perfection (τὸ τέλειον) which we were anxious to gain. For we were enlightened; and that is to know God. He therefore who knows that which is perfect is not himself imperfect. And blame me not for confessing that we know God; for thus it pleased the Word to speak; and He is free. While the Lord was actually being baptized (αὐτίκα βαπτιζομένῳ), a voice from heaven resounded to Him in testimony to the Beloved, 'Thou art My Son; I have to-day begotten Thee.' Let us ask these wise men, then,—Is Christ, having been 'born again to-day,' already perfect, or is He,—a monstrous supposition,—deficient? If the latter, He needs to learn somewhat additional. But it is not to be supposed that He, being God, can acquire any additional knowledge whatsoever. No one can be greater than the Word,—nor the teacher, assuredly, of the Only Teacher. Will they, then, unwillingly acknowledge that the Word, sprung perfect from a

Father who is perfect, was, according to the design of Providence, born again perfectly? And if He was perfect, why was the Perfect One undergoing baptism? It was necessary for Him, they say, to fulfil the profession which it behoved man to make. Very good; I say the same. Does He then become perfect at the same time that He is baptized by John? Evidently. Then He received no further knowledge from him? No. But He is perfected by the laver alone, and sanctified by the descent of the Spirit? Yes, that is so. Well, the same takes place also in connexion with ourselves, whose pattern the Lord is made. Being baptized, we are enlightened; being enlightened, we are adopted as sons; being adopted, we are perfected; being perfected, we are rendered immortal. 'I,' such are the words, 'have said, Ye are Gods and ye are all sons of the Highest.' But this work bears various names,—gift of grace, and enlightenment, and perfection, and laver (*χάρισμα, καὶ φώτισμα, καὶ τέλειον, καὶ λουτρόν*);—laver, by means of which we are cleansed from the filth of sins; gift of grace, whereby the penalties due to our sins are remitted; enlightenment, through which that holy light which is our salvation is set before our eyes,—that is, our sight is quickened to see God (*τὸ θεῖον ὀξυωπούμεν*);—by perfection we understand the lack of nothing; for what is still wanting to one who knows God?"[1]

The predominant aspect of Baptism presented in

[1] *Paed.* i. 6 (pp. 112, 113 Potter). Compare the noble passage, *Prophet. Eclog.* § 5.

these sentences is the intellectual aspect. Baptism is perfection; perfection is the *knowledge* of God. If Christ's "regeneration"—an expression found in other ancient authors also[1]—made Him perfect, He had no longer anything to *learn*. But the words of Clement involve more than a mere impartition of doctrine at Baptism. Not to mention the forgiveness of sins,[2] Baptism is regeneration and adoption; and, if Christ's Baptism is the "pattern" of ours, Baptism is also the "descent of the Spirit," and consequent sanctification. Now all these are, according to S. Clement, comprised in "perfection," and perfection is, he tells us, obtained by "the laver alone." There is nothing to come after the laver. Yet undoubtedly in the "laver alone" Clement includes a whole sequence of baptismal rites. It is "while Christ is actually being baptized" that the voice from heaven is heard, though Clement was well aware that the moment of the immersion was over, and that our Lord was coming or come up out of the water before that sign was given. Clement, therefore, does not mean to affirm that in the sacrament of Baptism itself there was no need of any further rite after the laver, but that after that sacrament, taken as a whole, the baptized was to be considered a perfect and fully "enlightened" Christian.

We may now proceed to inquire what other baptismal rites are recognised by Clement, and what

[1] *E.g.* Max. Taur. *Hom.* xxx.

[2] It is remarkable that the word χάρισμα should not make Clement think of anything more positive than the bounty of a free pardon.

efficacy he ascribed to them. From the nature of this Father's language it would be dangerous to affirm that Unction was practised in his day, if there were no independent grounds for supposing such to be the case. It seems, however, indisputable that the custom must have been universally used in Clement's time; and there is at any rate one passage in his writings in which (if the reading is correct) he makes a direct and literal reference to it. The passage is one in which he describes the life of the true "Gnostic." Amongst other features of his self-discipline, he "the truly royal man," the "holy priest of God,"—

"Does not admit those spectacular pleasures (already referred to), nor those diversions which come through other enjoyments, such as costly odours which bewitch the sense of smell, or elaborate viands and the enjoyment of various wines that entice the taste, . . . but always first referring to God the solemn enjoyment, whether of food, or of drink, or of unction, he offers the beginning to the Bestower of all, giving Him thanks, both by means of the Gift and of the Anointing, and by means of the rational nature that was given to him."[1]

[1] *Strom.* vii. 7 (p. 852 Potter). The words are, in Potter's edition, *πάντων δὲ τὴν σεμνὴν ἀπόλαυσιν ἐπὶ τὸν θεὸν ἀναγαγὼν ἀεί, καὶ τῆς βρώσεως καὶ τοῦ πόματος καὶ τοῦ χρίσματος, τῷ δοτῆρι τῶν ὅλων ἀπάρχεται, χάριν ὁμολογῶν, καὶ διὰ τῆς δωρεᾶς καὶ τῆς χρήσεως, καὶ διὰ λόγου τοῦ δοθέντος αὐτῷ.* But the only manuscript at this point gives *χρίσεως* instead of *χρήσεως*; and this seems to give the best sense. The reading *χρήσεως* would, I suppose, mean, that the Christian consecrates his enjoyment of these things in a threefold way, (1) by presenting the firstfruits of them to God, (2) by his mode of using them, (3) by reflexion upon them. But this would require *δόσεως* rather than *δωρεᾶς*, and would also demand the repetition of the *διὰ*

If this is the right interpretation of his words, then Clement here distinctly refers to the sacramental anointing in Baptism, which he sets alongside of the Holy Eucharist, regarding the religious use of the Chrism, like that of the Eucharistic Bread and Wine, as a consecration of the use of the same in ordinary life. All other employment of "food, or drink, or unction," reminds the man of the august purpose to which these things have already been put in his spiritual career.

It is doubtless to the same usage that Clement refers when, in his notes on a system with which he was partly in agreement and partly not, he quotes the school of Theodotus as teaching that

"The bread and the oil are sanctified by the power of the Name, and, contrary to appearance, are no longer the same things as they were when they were taken, but have been changed by power into spiritual power."[1]

He does not tell us, however, in these two passages, what was the purpose of this consecration of the oil, or what that "spiritual power" was which was imparted to it. This must be gathered from other parts of his works. The following may serve for specimens.[2]

before τῆς χρήσεως. I take it, then, that ἡ δωρεὰ is used absolutely, to mean the Eucharist (see Suicer *s.v.*), and that, in accordance with the twice (not thrice) repeated διά, S. Clement speaks of a twofold mode of consecrating the use of "food and drink and unction,"—(1) by their application in sacraments, (2) by intelligent employment in common life.—It is noticeable that the "Gnostic" is described only a few lines before as king and priest, a combination which Clement says is "still preserved among the best advised of the barbarians."

[1] *Excerpt. Theodot.* § 82.

[2] It might seem from the special mention of "thanksgiving" in the

We have seen that Tertullian, Clement's contemporary, considered the gift of the Spirit to be the restoration of man to the likeness of that God in whose image he was made. The same thought is not unfrequently set forth by Clement, who seems to make the commencement of this restoration identical with regeneration. He says, for instance:—

"I believe that He (*i.e.* the Word) both formed man out of the dust, and begat him again with water, and increased him with the Spirit, and tutored him with the spoken word, unto adoption and salvation, directing him with holy commandments, for this very purpose that by a progressive transformation of the earthborn man into a holy and heavenly man, He might specially fulfil that Divine utterance, 'Let Us make man after Our image, and after Our likeness.' And indeed Christ has become fully all that God here speaks of; but other men are conceived of after the image only. But we, O children of a good Father, pupils of a good Tutor, let us fulfil the Father's will; let us ever hear the Word; and let us take the impress of our Saviour's truly saving life, from this very moment practising the heavenly conversation, according to which becoming transformed into Divine (ἐκθεούμενοι), let us always be anointed with the unction which is ever fresh in delight and unspoiled in fragrance, having for a visible pattern of immor-

passage from the *Stromateis*, that S. Clement's view of the value of the Unction is exactly that of the Constitutions, in which, as we have seen, it is specially called "the Oil of Thanksgiving," see p. 252.

tality the conversation of the Lord, and following the steps of God." [1]

All men, says Clement, bear the image of God; Christ alone (in His humanity) perfectly attained His likeness, but He takes the believer and puts him in the way to attain that likeness. The first step toward the attainment is the being "begotten again with water, and increased with the Spirit;" after which follows the lifelong discipline of imitating the example and obeying the precepts of Christ. Clement's expression, "begat him again with water, and increased him with the Spirit," already appears to suggest two different movements of Divine grace, not one and the same; and Bishop Lowth, in his contributions to Potter's edition, does not hesitate to refer the words which follow, "always anointed with the unction which is ever fresh," to "the Chrism used in Baptism," which would, no doubt, answer to the "increase" spoken of.

Commending the pure charity which the Gospel teaches, as against the attractions of physical beauty, S. Clement speaks of the Christian as

"Exhibiting to the angels which preside over the

[1] *Paed.* i. 12 (p. 156 Potter); see the note there. S. Clement considers the "image" to belong to man as man, the "likeness" to be attained by the Christian who diligently uses the grace and the revelation of God; comp. *Cohort. ad Graec.* 12 (p. 94 Potter), "We may well now say and believe that the godly Christian alone . . . is an image of God and His likeness as well (εἰκόνα τοῦ θεοῦ μεθ' ὁμοιώσεως), being made by Christ Jesus righteous and holy with prudence, and, to that extent, already like to God. The prophet does not conceal this grace, saying, 'I said, Ye are Gods and ye are all sons of the Highest'; for He has adopted us, yes, even us, and wills to be called our Father and ours only, not the Father of those who disobey Him"

upward road, by way of a holy token, the mark (χαρακτῆρα), the shining mark, of righteousness,—I speak of the chrism of well pleasing (τὸ χρίσμα τῆς εὐαρεστήσεως), the quality of disposition which is produced upon the soul when it is made glad according to the coming upon it of the Holy Ghost."[1]

There is a section of his *Paedagogus* in which Clement discusses the question whether a Christian is justified in using "wreaths and ointments" in ordinary life, and comes to a general decision in the negative. Oil, indeed, he allows, but not ointments, except for quasi-medicinal purposes. If any one should be disposed to plead in opposition that our Lord did not reject the woman who poured ointment upon His feet, Clement replies, not only with a very sensible argument from the historical circumstances of the action, but also with a mystical interpretation. Apologizing for what may, he thinks, appear wanting in good taste, he says,

"These feet of the Lord which were anointed are the Apostles,—it being a prophecy of the sweet savour of the chrism,—after becoming partakers of the Holy Spirit."[2]

[1] *Strom.* iv. 18 (p. 616 Potter). The "angels which preside over the upward road" appear to be taken from Barnabas § 18, where, speaking of the "two ways," he says that the one is under the custody of φωταγωγοὶ ἄγγελοι. To them is exhibited the mark of righteousness, as a σύμβολον, or "tally," or "ticket," by which they may know that the bearer has a right to pass. The meaning of the last words κατ' ἐπιχώρησιν τοῦ ἁγ. πν. is doubtful. Usually ἐπιχώρησις means a "concession," "permission;" but here it seems better to take it in the more primitive sense.

[2] *Paed.* ii. 8 (p. 205 Potter). A few lines after, he adds an alternative interpretation, which introduces a play of words which is very

Again,

"The men among us ought assuredly not to smell of unguents, but of good life and character,—and let a woman breathe of Christ, the royal unction, not of scents and unguents; and let her be anointed always with the ambrosial chrism of sobriety, rejoicing in a holy unguent, which is the Spirit. With this unguent the Lord Himself is anointed, as hath been shown through David,—'Therefore God, even Thy God, hath anointed Thee with the oil of gladness above Thy fellows. All Thy garments smell of myrrh, aloes, and cassia.'"[1]

It will be gathered from these passages that S. Clement, as is natural, considered the Unction to be symbolical of the gift of the Holy Ghost, though not necessarily as conveying it. It represents to his mind freshness and fragrance, gladness and thanksgiving, that aspect of righteousness by which man is made "well pleasing" to God and attractive to men, by participation of Christ, through the Spirit.

There are not wanting places in S. Clement's works

familiar in the Greek ecclesiastical authors;—"In this way we understand the oil (ἔλαιον) mystically, which is the Lord Himself, from whom comes the mercy (ἔλεος) extended to us." The words which follow would almost lead us to suppose that the oil which was used for ecclesiastical purposes was as yet oil pure and simple; for he contrasts this oil which symbolizes mercy with the μύρον, or perfumed unguent, which is, he says, "oil adulterated," and signifies Judas the traitor, and, from its funeral use, the end of our Lord's life on earth. It will be observed that the Egyptian Constitutions also speak of the chrism as "oil" only. But the inference is precarious. A few lines lower, Clement appears not to think so ill of the symbolism of the μύρον.

[1] *Ibid.* p. 208.

where reference is made also to the Laying on of Hands.

In one of these, it is not clear whether the author refers to Confirmation, or only to that form of blessing which it was customary for devout Christians at Alexandria to seek every day. Most probably, however, he means Confirmation. Clement is instructing those who are looking forward to Baptism about matters of ordinary conduct. He admonishes the women with much particularity concerning their dress, and in the course of so doing dissuades them somewhat grotesquely from wearing false hair:

"The wearing of other people's hair is altogether to be renounced; and it is most ungodly to furnish the head with locks not native to it, arraying the pate with dead tresses. For on whom (in such a case) does the presbyter lay on his hand? Whom will he bless? Not the woman so adorned, but the other person's hairs, and through them a different head."[1]

As, in the case of Irenæus and Hippolytus, we infer something of the Catholic teaching about Unction from what they tell us of the practice of the Gnostics, so Clement records for us the use which some of them made of Laying on of Hands in a way which illustrates the use of it in the Church. The imaginative school of the Valentinians,—at any rate the Eastern branch,—were accustomed to employ an imposition of hands which was definitely imitated from Confirmation, and, like it, formed a part of their initiatory baptism. Those whom S. Paul speaks of as being

[1] *Paed.* iii. 11 (p. 291 Potter). "Presbyter" here means "bishop."

baptized for the dead, are, according to them, redeeming angels who take compassion upon men, as they lie dead in the life of the flesh;—

"In order that we also, having the Name, may not be kept back, or hindered by the 'Boundary' or 'Cross' from passing into the Pleroma. Wherefore also, in the Laying on of Hands, they say at the end, 'Into the angelic redemption,' that is, the redemption which the angels possess,—in order that the man who has obtained the redemption may be held to have been baptized in the same Name in which his angel also has been previously baptized. Now the angels were baptized at the beginning in the redemption of the name of him that came down in the dove upon Jesus, and redeemed him."[1]

This fragment is of much importance to the history of Confirmation. It is, so far as I know, the only positive evidence that can be adduced for the continuous use of the Laying on of Hands in Baptism between the close of the Canon of Scripture and the times of Tertullian and Clement. Valentine flourished in the middle of the second century; Theodotus, who is Clement's authority for these statements, must have headed the Eastern Valentinians a little later.[2] From S. Clement's mode of expression, "in the Laying on of Hands (ἐν τῇ χειροθεσίᾳ)," it is plain that the

[1] Clem. Al. *Excerpt. Theodot.* § 22.

[2] It has been conjectured that Theodotus is the same as the Theodas who was said to have been Valentine's master, and to have been himself acquainted with S. Paul. This is plausible, but involves difficulties which need not be discussed here: see Lipsius in Smith and Wace *Dict. of Chr. Biogr.* "*Valentinus*," p. 1076.

heretical sect was not regarded as instituting a novel rite, nor yet as retaining one which had died out of the Church. They were but putting a strange interpretation upon a ceremony which formed a normal part of the Church's Baptism, and had therefore been incorporated into that of the sect. It may fairly be concluded also that the doctrine of the Church in the days of Valentine or Theodotus about the meaning of this ceremony was much the same as that which appears in the Acts of the Apostles on the one hand, and in later ecclesiastical authors on the other, from the way in which it is connected in the Gnostic imitation with the descent of the dove upon "Jesus," and with the "entrance into the fulness."[1]

It is of interest to observe in this connexion that the Valentinians, according to Clement, held

"That the Spirit which the prophets, singly, had as a peculiar endowment for ministry, was poured out upon all those who belong to the Church; wherefore

[1] In another passage, Clement argues against the later libertine schools of Gnostics from the doctrine of the earlier and severer schools, quoting a touching piece of advice given by Isidore, son of the famous heresiarch Basilides. In case a young Gnostic was hindered by circumstances from marriage, Isidore advised him never to be alone:—"Let him not be parted from his brother. Let him say, 'I have entered into the Holy Place; I cannot be overcome by passion.' If some evil suggestion besets him, let him say, 'Brother, lay thy hand upon me, that I may not sin,' and he shall receive succour both ghostly and bodily. Let him but will to accomplish what is good, and he shall succeed" (*Strom.* iii. 1, p. 510 Potter). Such advice, indeed, points rather to the repeated and benedictory application of the hand, to which reference has already been made, than to Confirmation itself; but it at least well brings out the natural and inherent significance of that action, solemnising and strengthening the believer's will.

also the signs of the Spirit, healings and prophesyings, are performed through the Church. But they do not know that the Paraclete, working, as He does, now, closely, in the Church, is of the same essence and power with Him that worked so closely under the Old Testament."[1]

No one can pretend that the doctrine of S. Clement upon the points under consideration is particularly lucid. But at any rate, Baptism is seen to have been for him a complex sacrament, of which Washing, Anointing, and Imposition of the Hand, all were parts. This complex sacrament bears many different titles, which appear to be derived now from one part of it, now from another. By means of it the believer becomes a partaker of the Holy Spirit. Clement does not state in so many words which part of the sacrament he regarded as conveying this blessing, but it may be inferred from a comparison of the various passages that he would connect the blessing with the after ceremonies, rather than with the immersion, and most of all with the Laying on of Hands.

Clement's opinion about the nature and benefit of the gift of the Spirit, would have been better known to us if either he had been able to accomplish his literary purposes, or perhaps if all his works had come down to us. It is difficult at present to see, in the fragment quoted a few lines above, wherein the Valentinian teaching fell short of the Catholic teaching as apprehended by Clement. Clement was evidently prepared to put a very rich interpre-

[1] *Excerpt. Theodot.* § 24.

tation upon the Catholic doctrine concerning the indwelling of the Holy Ghost. Man, as man, in his belief, was endowed with a large measure of that which is Divine, but the Christian gift is something which far outstrips the natural endowment:—

"Certainly man is far from being destitute of Divine perception,—man, whom we distinctly read to have received the inbreathing at his creation, partaking of a purer essence than the other animals. . . . But we affirm that the Holy Ghost is breathed in a new sense upon him who has believed (τῷ πεπιστευκότι προσεπιπνεῖσθαι) . . . For it has been plainly said through Joel, one of the twelve prophets, 'And it shall come to pass afterwards, that I will pour out of My Spirit upon all flesh.' . . . But the Spirit in each of us is not in each of us as a part of God. The principle of this distribution, and what the Holy Spirit is, we will set forth in our works on Prophecy and on the Soul." [1]

Clement's work in the Catechetical School at Alexandria was carried on by his illustrious pupil Origen. Origen was born A.D. 185 or 186, and began his career as master of the school at the early age of seventeen. He nowhere gives us in his writings, what he must have delivered orally to his catechumens, a detailed account of the ceremonies to be undergone by them in Baptism, and of the value to be attached to them severally; but all three parts of the sacrament are mentioned by him at various times; and his doctrine, so far as it can be gathered, concerning all the three,

[1] *Strom.* v. 13 (p. 698 Potter).

is precisely that which was taught in the West. To write out all that Origen says about Baptism (considered as a whole) would occupy many pages. It will be enough here to adduce those few passages in which he seems to resolve it into its various elements.

References to the baptismal Unction in Origen are rare,—indeed surprisingly rare. Texts in the Psalms, for instance, and in the Song of Songs, which suggest to other writers a mention of the Chrism, are otherwise interpreted by Origen. I do not remember any passage in which he speaks directly of it, except one where, discussing the birth "from above," he says, in support of that rendering of the word ἄνωθεν :—

"To establish the fact that the baptism is 'from above,' we shall not do ill to join to the Holy Spirit those 'waters which be above the firmament' and 'praise the Lord.' And although according to the form traditionally delivered to the Churches (*secundum typum ecclesiis traditum*) we have all been baptized in the visible waters, and in the visible Chrism, yet (only) he who has died to sin, and is truly baptized in Christ's death, and is buried with Him by Baptism into death, is truly baptized in the Holy Ghost and the water which is from above." [1]

The introduction of the Chrism here is abrupt and unexpected. It seems to be explained by the contrast between these two outward elements in Baptism, and the two celestial counterparts. Over against the visible waters stands the "water which is from above," with its cleansing and regenerating effect;

[1] *Comment. in Ep. ad Rom.* tom vi. § 8 (p. 561 D Migne).

over against the visible Chrism is set the gift of the Holy Ghost. Both the water and the Chrism are parts of Baptism, and that by widespread and authoritative tradition.

Origen's language about the Laying on of Hands is precisely that in which the Pseudo-Primasius at a later time summed the matter up. The only difference is that Origen does not positively speak of the usage as still continued in the Church of his own day, or (if so) as followed by the same effects. The Laying on of Hands was, or had been, in Origen's view an integral part of Baptism, but not an otiose, or merely symbolical part. It conveyed the supreme gift.

"In the Acts of the Apostles," he says, "through the Laying on of the apostolic Hands the Holy Ghost was given (*dabatur*) in Baptism."[1]

And again, after shewing from various other Scriptures that the Holy Ghost is not in all men, but in those who have received a special renovation which fits them for His indwelling, he adds:—

"Lastly, it is for this reason that the grace and revelation of the Holy Ghost was delivered (*tradebatur*) through the Laying on of the Hands of the Apostles, after Baptism."[2]

These two sentences balance one another. What is said in the one to be given "in Baptism," is said in the other to be given "after Baptism." It all depends upon the latitude allowed to that word. If Baptism includes Confirmation, as it did in apostolic days, then the Holy Ghost is given "in" it. If Bap-

[1] *De Princ.* I. iii. 2 (p. 61). [2] *Ibid.* 7 (p. 63).

tism means only what it passes for in modern English parlance, then the Holy Ghost is given "after" it, and Baptism is a preparation for the gift, a renewal which qualifies a man to receive it.

From the context in which these sentences occur, it will be seen that Origen had no intention of suggesting that the apostolic practice was different from that of his own time. Rather, if anything, he is justifying the practice of his own time by showing that it was the practice of the Apostles. And although I am not aware of any other place in his works where he explicitly speaks of the acts which constitute Confirmation, he very plainly and repeatedly implies that the special bestowal of the Holy Spirit's indwelling must be looked for after Baptism (in the restricted sense), not in it.

"It should be known," he says in one place, "that the washing by means of the water, symbolical as it is of the cleansing of the soul, as she washes off every stain that comes from wickedness, is, . . . to him who yields himself to the divine power of the invocations of the adorable Trinity, the beginning and source of spiritual gifts (*ἡ χαρισμάτων ἀρχὴ καὶ πηγή*)[1]. For there is a diversity of spiritual gifts. The statement is supported by the account recorded in the Acts of the Apostles, how the Holy Ghost in those days so evidently took up His abode in those who were being baptized, His way being made ready in advance (in the case of genuine receivers) by the water (*τοῖς βαπτιζομένοις ἐπιδεδημηκέναι, προευτρεπίσαντος αὐτῷ του*

[1] Compare *Comment. in Ioann.* tom. ii. § 6, p. 62.

ὕδατος ὁδόν), that even Simon the sorcerer in astonishment desired to receive this grace from Peter,—though he desired to gain that which is most righteous by means of the mammon of unrighteousness. And we may here observe that the baptism of John was inferior to the Baptism of Jesus given by means of His disciples. For those who, in the Acts, had been baptized into the baptism of John, not having so much as heard that there is any Holy Ghost, are baptized a second time by the Apostle. For the (Baptism) of the new birth was not to be found with John, but with Jesus by means of His disciples—the washing of regeneration, as it is called,—accompanied by renewing of the Spirit, which even now moves (for He is from God) upon the face of the water, though He does not come to be in all after the water."[1]

Words could hardly be more remarkable than those in which Origen describes the Samaritan converts as still in process of being baptized when the Apostles laid their hands on them. Though the process had been arrested, and delayed a long enough time to allow word to reach Jerusalem and the Apostles to make their journey down to Samaria, yet Origen regards the men as still βαπτιζόμενοι,—midway in the reception of the sacrament. Part of it had been administered already,—that part of it which was preparatory

[1] *Comm. in Ioann.* tom. vi. § 17, p. 133. Compare *Comm. in Matt.* tom. xv. § 23, p. 685, "This regeneration (Matt. xix. 28) is preluded by that which Paul calls the laver of regeneration, and this newness by that which is implied to move over the laver of regeneration in the expression 'renewing of the Spirit.'" Here the same twofold grace of baptism is intended

to the coming of the Holy Ghost, namely the purifying and regenerating water,—but the Baptism was not yet ended. The washing was indeed necessary to the reception of the Holy Ghost, and is, therefore, "the beginning and source" of the various spiritual gifts; but it is but a part of Baptism after all. He who "moves over the water" of Baptism waits till "after the water" to plant His indwelling presence in those who are baptized.

These explicit words must be borne in mind when we find Origen in other less explicit passages implying that the receiving of the Holy Ghost is the great thing to be desired in Baptism, to fail of which is to fail of everything. Thus, commenting on Ezek. xvi. 4, *aqua non es lota in salutem*, he says:—

"Not all are 'washed unto salvation.' We who have received the grace of Baptism in the name of Christ, have been washed; but I know not which has been washed unto salvation. Simon was washed; and, after obtaining Baptism, he continued in Philip's company, but because he was not washed unto salvation, he was condemned by him who said to him in the Holy Ghost, 'Thy money perish with thee.' It is a matter of tremendous difficulty for him who is washed to be washed unto salvation. Attend, O catechumens; listen; and in consequence of what you hear, prepare yourselves while you are still catechumens, while you are as yet unbaptized; that you may come to the laver and be washed unto salvation, and not be washed after the fashion of some, who have been washed, but not unto salvation—of him

who receives the water and does not receive the Spirit. He who is washed unto salvation, receives both the water and the Holy Ghost. Because Simon was not washed unto salvation, he received the water, but did not receive the Holy Ghost, thinking that the gift of the Spirit could be purchased with money,—and so his washing was not unto salvation."[1]

Or again :—

"I speak of some catechumens,—with whom, it may be, many also of those who have already obtained Baptism are joined. 'They are not all Israelites who are of Israel;' nor are all who have been washed with the water washed then and there with the Holy Spirit also;—just as, on the other hand, not all who are numbered among the catechumens, are strangers to the Holy Spirit and destitute of Him. For I find in the Divine Scriptures that several catechumens were considered meet for the Holy Ghost; and that others, after receiving Baptism, were unworthy of the grace of the Holy Ghost. Cornelius was a catechumen; and before he came to the water, he was held deserving to receive the Holy Ghost. Simon had received Baptism; but because he came to the grace with hypocrisy, he is repelled from the gift of the Holy Ghost. I would not have you to doubt that there are now among the numbers of catechumens some Corneliuses, to whom it may be said, 'Thine alms and thy prayers are gone up into heaven,' and again that there are among the number of the Faithful some Simons, to whom it must be said unhesitatingly, 'O full of all

[1] *In Ezech. Hom.* vi. § 5 (p. 378).

deceit and guile, thou son of the devil, enemy of all righteousness.'"[1]

Such passages show very decidedly that to "receive the water and not to receive the Holy Ghost" is to make a disastrous failure, and that any rightly qualified candidate for Baptism "receives both the water and the Holy Ghost;" yet they do not mean that Origen expected the gift of the Holy Ghost to be conveyed by the baptismal water itself, except so far as the baptismal water is normally a preparation for receiving it.

Origen's Alexandrian contemporary, Theognostus, as quoted by S. Athanasius, appears in like manner to have regarded Baptism as a complex sacrament, in which the gift of the Spirit is the climax and the completion. Speaking of the blasphemy against the Holy Ghost, and the reason why it is more fatal than blasphemy against the Son, he says (as Origen also does) that the latter is the sin of catechumens, while the former is the sin of those who have received "the doctrine delivered at the perfecting and the participation of the Spirit" (ἐπὶ τῇ τελειώσει καὶ τῇ τοῦ πνεύματος μετοχῇ). "The Son," he adds, "condescends to the imperfect, but the Spirit is the seal of those who are perfected" (τῶν τελειουμένων).[2] If we may interpret the language of Theognostus by what we have seen in Clement, then the "perfecting" will mean the

[1] *In Num. Hom.* iii. § 1 (p. 280). Comp. *in Levit. Hom.* vi. § 2 (p. 216); *in Num. Hom.* vi. § 3 (p. 287). The word "Faithful" is, of course, used in its technical sense, as equivalent to "baptized."

[2] Ap. Athan. *Epist. IV. ad Serap.* § 11.

sacrament by which the catechumen passes fully into the circle of Christian believers. Baptism is the "perfecting"; and it includes the "seal" and "the participation of the Spirit." There can be little question what part of the baptismal sacrament is the most prominently before the eyes of Theognostus as he writes these words.

Of the letters on Baptism written by Origen's disciple "the great Bishop of Alexandria,"[1] Denys, unhappily fragments only have been preserved to us. They were written in the height of the controversy between Cyprian and Stephen. Denys himself was on the side of acknowledging the validity of heretical baptisms, but earnestly deprecated the hasty excommunication of those who took the opposite course. If we had had the full text of his writings, we should no doubt have found that he would have assented to the teaching of the author *De Rebaptismate*, or S. Cyprian either, regarding the relation of Confirmation to Baptism, but his extant words do not touch upon the point. He only uses the universal language which connects the indwelling of the Holy Ghost indefinitely with Baptism,—though at the same time he seems to admit the possibility of a return of the Holy Ghost after forfeiture, perhaps alluding to the imposition of hands by which he held that the penitent ought to be received back from schism.[2]

[1] Eus. *Hist. Eccl.* VII. *praef.* ὁ μέγας Ἀλεξανδρέων ἐπίσκοπος.

[2] Ap. Eus. *Hist. Eccl.* VII. 8: τὸ λουτρὸν ἀθετοῦντι τὸ ἅγιον [Νοουατιανῷ] . . . τό τε πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον ἐξ αὐτῶν, εἰ καί τις ἦν ἐλπὶς τοῦ παραμεῖναι ἢ καὶ ἐπανελθεῖν πρὸς αὐτούς, παντελῶς φυγαδεύοντι.

There are no further words from Alexandria, that I know of, bearing upon the subject until we reach S. Athanasius, who succeeded to the Evangelical See sixty-one years after it had been vacated by Denys. There is no reason to think that the doctrine of Baptism had undergone any noticeable change in the meanwhile, but the undoubted works of Athanasius do not directly examine the relation between the component parts of the sacrament.

It is plain that Athanasius regarded the impartition of the Spirit and the regeneration of the sons of God as being so closely connected that the latter was the consequence of the former, if not actually identical with it. Thus, for instance, dwelling on the difference between our sonship by grace and Christ's by nature, he speaks of men as

"Having received the Spirit by way of participation (οἱ κατὰ μετοχὴν πνεῦμα λαβόντες); concerning whom also He said, 'I begat and reared up sons, and they set me at naught.' No doubt, because they were not sons by nature, therefore, when they turned away, the Spirit was taken from them, and they were disowned,—and moreover when they repent, He will receive them again and, giving them the light, will again call them sons."[1]

It does not appear to have occurred to this great champion of the Godhead of the Son and of the Spirit to discriminate between the motion which imparts the Divine nature and that which implants the Divine indwelling; and in this way also it comes

[1] *Orat.* I. *c. Arian.* § 37.

about that when he has occasion to speak of the successive bestowals of the Spirit at the Paschal and Pentecostal seasons, he seems not to observe any difference between them.

But if so, a careful examination of the language of Athanasius will shew, not that he attributed the gift of the Spirit to the first act in Baptism by itself, but that he rather attributed the notion of regeneration and sonship to the sacrament as a whole, completed by Unction and Imposition of Hands.

About Unction S. Athanasius only speaks in the indirect way which is common among the fathers, using the language of Holy Scripture which, were it not for other information, would leave it doubtful whether an external rite was alluded to or not. This may serve for an example:—

"The Spirit is called Unction; He is also Seal. John writes, 'And the unction which ye received from Him abideth in you, and ye have no need that any teach you, but as His Unction'—His Spirit—'teacheth you concerning all things.' In the prophet Isaias it is written, 'The Spirit of the Lord is upon Me, because He anointed Me.' Paul says, 'In whom, having believed, ye were sealed unto a day of redemption.' . . . The Unction has the sweet savour and smell of Him who anoints; and those who are anointed, partaking of this unction, say, 'We are a sweet savour of Christ.' The Seal has the form of Christ who seals, and those who are sealed partake of this form, being themselves formed in accordance with it, as the Apostle says, 'My little children, with whom I

travail in birth again, until Christ be formed in you.'" [1]

It is evident that in saying "those who are anointed," "those who are sealed," the writer means distinctly those who undergo the rites so called in the Church; though, of course, he might have been otherwise interpreted if such rites had not been known to exist in his time.

About the Laying on of Hands Athanasius speaks with no uncertainty—at any rate in referring to the past. It is an important factor in the process by which men are born again in Christ. Contending for the difference between the word "Spirit" when placed by itself, and when accompanied by the definite article or some other word which shews that the Holy Ghost is intended, he says:—

"Indeed, without the article or such an addition as I have spoken of, the Holy Ghost would not be meant. Take, for instance, what S. Paul writes to the Galatians, 'This only would I learn of you, did ye receive the Spirit (*τὸ πνεῦμα*) by works of law, or by hearing of faith?' What spirit had they received but the Holy Ghost, given to those who believe and are being born again (*ἀναγεννωμένοις*) through the laver of regeneration?"

Thus far the question is left open, at what exact moment, and by what act, in the process of regeneration, S. Athanasius believed that Spirit to have been given. It would even seem as if he looked no further than the laver. But a few sentences lower, the matter becomes plain:—

[1] *Epist.* I. *ad Serap.* § 23.

"Summing up the whole revelation of God and the perfecting of us (*τὴν πᾶσαν θεολογίαν καὶ τὴν ἡμῶν τελείωσιν*), whereby He would unite us to Himself and through Himself to the Father, in this sentence, He charged His disciples, 'Go ye, make all the nations disciples, baptizing them into the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Ghost.' And having promised to send Him to them, He charged them 'not to depart from Jerusalem;' and after a few days . . . 'they were all filled with the Holy Ghost, and began to speak with other tongues, according as the Spirit gave them utterance.' From that time therefore also by the Laying on of the Apostles' Hands the Holy Ghost was given to those who were being born again (*ἀναγεννωμένοις, i.e.* in process of regeneration)."[1]

Thus regarding the process from the point of view of its spiritual effect, even as Origen did from the point of view of the external rites, S. Athanasius treats the work of regeneration as still incomplete until the Holy Ghost is given by the Imposition of Hands. As for Origen men are still *βαπτιζόμενοι*,—in course of being baptized,—when, after the water, they are waiting for their Confirmation, so to S. Athanasius they are still *ἀναγεννώμενοι*,—in course of being begotten anew,—until they have received the Spirit by the hands of the Apostles.

[1] *Epist.* I. *ad Serap.* §§ 4, 6. I have translated *τοῖς ἀναγεννωμένοις*, "those who were being born again," although the present (imperfect) tense might mean "those who from time to time were born again." But the other passages quoted will shew plainly enough that in S. Athanasius' view, regeneration was not complete until the Holy Ghost had been received.

No doubt in this passage Athanasius is only speaking of what he finds in Scripture, and not directly of the contemporary practice of his Church. Even so, however, the significance of what I have just observed remains,—that he regarded the apostolic Confirmation and its gift as an actual factor in the regenerating effect of Baptism. But nothing that he says can be taken to imply that he is describing an order of things which was obsolete in his own time; and if we may use as genuine the work *De Trinitate et Spiritu Sancto*, S. Athanasius expresses himself as strongly about the Laying on of Hands as any of the African divines does.

That work only exists in a Latin translation, and has been the object of not unnatural suspicion; but the Benedictine editors "unhesitatingly ascribe" the original to the great Doctor.[1] The author, after

[1] It must be owned that the Benedictine editors of S. Athanasius were not always as much on the alert as might have been expected. In the same volume with the *De Trin. et Spir. Sto.* they publish as "attributed to him" (though they themselves do not think it bears marks of being his) a long fragment chiefly taken from a not more recondite quarter than S. Chrysostom on the Epistle to the Hebrews. There can be no doubt that the *de Trin. et Sp. Sto.* is at least made up out of Athanasian materials by a clumsy translator. Ancient translators often took liberties with their texts, and it is possible that the passages below quoted may have been "adapted" by whatever hand effected the translation. I do not think, however, that there is any special reason to distrust the genuineness of their Athanasian authorship. It seems very improbable that the piece should have proceeded (as some have guessed) from Vigilius of Tapsus, whether as author or translator. The Bishop of Salisbury kindly procured for me the following opinion from the Rev. H. J. White, his fellow-worker upon the Latin versions of the Bible. "There is certainly nothing in the Latin of the Biblical citations which in the least suggests an African text; all the more obvious test words are rendered

saying, quite in the manner of S. Athanasius and the Alexandrians in general, that by the co-operation of the Holy Ghost with the Father and the Son "the washing of regeneration restores us to that primitive condition which existed before the fall of Adam," proceeds to say,

"And just as Adam was created, receiving the Spirit of Life, and man became a living soul, and, having the Holy Spirit, was a spiritual being, so that he even prophesied . . . saying 'This is the mother of all living;' likewise also all the saints, having received the Holy Spirit, in the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Ghost, through the Laying on of the Hands of the priest of God, are restored to that primitive state, in which they were before Adam fell."[1]

By comparison of these two passages, the same result is again obtained. The Laying on of Hands is part of the washing of regeneration, and that part of it in virtue of which we receive the Spirit and are restored to the condition originally intended for us.

in the European form; *e.g.* the work has *peccata* instead of the African *delicta*, *baptizo* instead of *tinguo*, *complacui* instead of *bene sensi* (for ηὐδόκησα), *glorifico* instead of *clarifico*, etc. . . . The Latin is certainly not African; what it *is*, is a harder question. In one or two cases it differs rather strangely from the Vulgate; *i.e.* in S. Matt. i. *nollet eam detegere* instead of *traducere* for παραδειγματίσαι. I do not remember to have come across *detegere* anywhere. No doubt if we could have time to examine the text at length, we might get to some important results. It is evidently not a mere translation from the Greek, but a quotation from a definite Latin version, and I think pre-Vulgate."

[1] *De Trin. et Sp. Sto.* §§ 8, 21. The text is in parts corrupt, but there is no ambiguity about the last sentence.

These words, if they are the words of S. Athanasius, are, so far as I know, the last in which any Greek or Eastern writer speaks of the Laying on Hands as a still living rite, until we come to the age of antiquaries, who describe by a scriptural name an action to which the name is not naturally appropriate. Doubtless the Laying on of Hands was fast passing, and had in most parts of the East already past, into an almost indistinguishable movement in the final Unction of Baptism. It is, therefore, in what the oriental Fathers say about Unction and the Seal that we must henceforth hope to find light thrown upon the subject of our inquiry.

Those who are acquainted with the writings of the great ascetic known as Macarius the Egyptian, who flourished in the fourth century, will know that not much help is to be expected from them upon the particular point in hand. There is perhaps no ancient writer whose works are so rich in the language of experience concerning the working of the Holy Ghost as Macarius the Egyptian, and it seems strange that his Homilies have never been brought more fully to the knowledge of the modern Church, as a companion volume to the *Imitation of Christ.* But the peculiarly mystical and pietistic turn of Macarius' thought obscures all reference to sacred rites. He might almost be ignorant of any sacramental mode of receiving the Holy Ghost, whether in Baptism or subsequently. Almost the only place where he mentions Baptism as a sacrament, it is for the purpose of showing how vain a thing it is for the most of its

possessors.[1] Of the things signified, however, Macarius speaks copiously. Here, like Athanasius, he makes no distinction between being regenerate and born of the Spirit on the one hand, and receiving the Spirit on the other,—save that some instinct seems to keep him from exhorting his hearers to seek the new birth, while the gift of the Spirit is constantly set before them as an object yet to be attained to. So far as words go, Macarius identifies the two things. The Foolish Virgins of the Parable are souls which remain in their natural state, and "are not born from above of the Spirit, not having received the Oil of gladness."[2] In the lower stages of Christian living, a man is still in danger of falling into the snares of Satan, "even though he be born of the Spirit, that is, though he become a partaker even of the Holy Ghost."[3] The same thing seems to hold good even when S. Macarius is using the language which must have recalled to him the various baptismal ceremonies.

"The man who subdues his own soul . . . is counted worthy to come to good measures of the Spirit, and receives through the Divine power the clean man, and becomes greater than himself. For such an one thenceforth is deified (ἀποθεοῦται), and becomes a son of God, receiving the heavenly seal in his soul. For God's elect are anointed with the hallowing oil, and become men of rank, and kings."[4]

[1] *Hom.* xv. § 15 (p. 585 Migne).
[2] *Hom.* iv. § 6 (p. 477 Migne).
[3] *De Patientia et Discretione* § 12 (p. 876 Migne).
[4] *Hom.* xv. § 35.

If Macarius had been a modern Methodist or Friend, he could scarcely have spoken with less regard to the fact that such spiritual blessings are sought in the Church by authorised means; yet his language testifies to the ideas which were commonly attached to the Unction and the Seal, and their close connexion with the new birth. Take again the following:—

"Perfect Christians, who have been counted worthy to come to measures of perfection and to be made nearest to the King, these are perpetually devoted to the cross of Christ. For as in the days of the prophets unction in the widest sense was held to be specially precious, since men were anointed to be kings and prophets, so now, spiritual men, being anointed with the heavenly unction (χρίσμα), become Christians according to grace, so that they are kings and prophets of heavenly mysteries. These also are sons, and lords, and gods,—being imprisoned, carried captive, drowned in the deep, crucified, devoted. For if the unction of oil, which came from a material plant, a visible tree, had such power, that those who were anointed indisputably received rank (for it was an assured thing, so that they were made kings,—and David after being anointed therewith fell straightway into persecutions and was afflicted, and after seven years became king),—how much more do all that are anointed according to the mind and the inner man with the hallowing and joyful-making oil of gladness, heavenly and spiritual, receive the seal of that kingdom of the incorruptible and everlasting power,

the earnest of the Spirit, the Holy Ghost the Comforter?"[1]

Macarius would perhaps have thought it a mark of a carnal mind to inquire whether it was the Laver itself which made a man a "Christian, according to grace," or the ensuing Unction; but his language about the corresponding realities makes it clear that only when the analogue of the washing is accompanied by the analogue of the anointing does the believer receive, in Macarius' opinion, the effect of a true Baptism—an effect not resoluble into separate parts.

The same sense of the unity of the baptismal graces shows itself in another distinguished Alexandrian, who was made master of the Catechetical School by S. Athanasius, the blind Didymus. His editor, Mingarelli, indeed, endeavours to shew that Didymus had clearly before his mind the idea of a distinct sacrament of Confirmation, apart from Baptism; but the effort is not wholly successful. To Didymus, as to other masters in his Church, regeneration, or the partaking of the Divine nature, was not a different thing from the reception of the Holy Ghost, and this was given in Baptism. Yet Baptism was to him a succession of sacred actions; and upon occasion he could consider apart the blessings suggested by them severally. When he does so, it is by no means his way to empty the concluding rites of grace in order to enrich the earlier ones. It appears as if he thought the benefit of Baptism itself to be chiefly a benefit

[1] *Hom.* xvii. § 1.

to the body. Reproving the super-spiritual tendency which was to be felt even in his own day, he says:—

"It should be observed that those who embraced Christianity perfectly were very zealous about the outward and visible Baptism. For whereas the thing given is twofold—partly by means of water, partly in Holy Ghost and fire—they did not on account of the superiority of the baptism in the Spirit despise that which was more bodily. For this also contributes to salvation, in the direction of the resurrection of the body. Many passages may be discovered in this book of the Acts, to commend the profitableness of the baptism of water."[1]

The words would bear the interpretation that Didymus was contrasting the whole series of external rites with the whole series of spiritual blessings that correspond with them, and taught that the body was benefited by the outward applications as the soul is benefited by the inward. But it would be more in accordance with a view which was common in early times, if we suppose Didymus to divide (as, for instance, the author *De Rebaptismate* does, and the Apostolical Constitutions) between the baptismal immersion on the one hand, which is a sacrament of resurrection to the body, and the descent of the Holy Ghost immediately after (for which other rites and prayers were to be employed), bringing inward renewal to the soul. It becomes almost certain that this is the true meaning, when we observe that Didymus is commenting upon that chapter of the Acts which

[1] *Fragm. in Act.* viii. 36.

makes so clear a distinction between Baptism itself and the subsequent gift of the Spirit.

That this was the belief of Didymus appears from what he says elsewhere, in a passage where he dwells at length upon the blessings of regeneration :—

"He said, 'Ye must be born of water,' because the washing away in Baptism of the filth of the body is a sign of [the change which takes place in] those who are being new created by the Holy Ghost. For our visible body is visibly brought forth, under the ministry of the priests, by the font; but invisibly, body and soul alike, under the agency of the angels, are baptized into Himself by the Spirit who is invisible to all intelligences, and so are regenerated. . . . For the human vessel, being an earthen vessel, needs first (*πρότερον*) the cleansing which the water gives, and then (*εἶτα*) also the invisible fire which perfects its strength) *στερέμνιον αὐτὸ ἀποτελοῦντος*), . . . that is, it needs the Holy Ghost who completes and renews (*ἀπαρτίζοντος καὶ ἀνακαινίζοντος*)."[1]

The second book of Didymus' great work on the Trinity is devoted to the doctrine of the Holy Ghost; and, as is natural, the author has much to say upon the impartition of that blessed Spirit in Baptism. In so doing, he often speaks—perhaps more often than other Fathers do—of the Spirit as given by means of the baptismal water. Yet in none of these places is he speaking of the baptismal water as contrasted with any other baptismal rite; it is his name for the sacrament as a whole, described by its most pro-

[1] *De Trin.* II. xii.

minent ceremony; and when discrimination between the various rites becomes necessary, then, so far as any division can be made in what Didymus regards as one, it is to the baptismal Unction that he traces the actual communication of the gift, rather than to the baptismal water.

"The creature," he says, "is anointed in Baptism with created, though consecrated, oil. The Saviour, as God, anointed Himself with His own equally uncreated Spirit, above His fellows, that is, above us. . . . That we also receive a chrism in the process of our renovation (ἐν τῷ ἀνακαινισμῷ) is written by John in the First Epistle, 'And ye have a chrism from the Holy One, and know all things.' As the Saviour, he says, in His earthly life had a chrism, so ye also have a chrism from the Holy Ghost. . . . Esaias teaches, 'And the Lord of Hosts shall make to all nations (a feast) upon this mountain; they shall drink wine, they shall be anointed with ointment in this mountain; deliver all these things to the nations.' . . . In mentioning wine, he foretold the Lord's saving Blood; in mentioning ointment, he foretold that with which, on being sanctified, we are anointed by the priest (ὃ ἁγιασθέντες ἀλειφόμεθα ὑπὸ τοῦ ἱερέως)."[1]

Thus this anointing, though subsequent to our purification, is given to us "in Baptism," "in the process of our renovation." The latter expression receives a fuller meaning when we see that, like other Fathers, especially at Alexandria, Didymus believed the effect

[1] *De Trin.* II. vi. 23.

of our Lord's breathing upon His disciples after the Resurrection to be the restoration of man to his original estate :—

"The Lord, in John, restoring to us the Holy Ghost, which we had lost by our primeval sin, breathed upon the faces of the disciples and said, 'Receive Holy Ghost; whosesoever sins ye remit, they are remitted unto them.'" [1]

It is this very restoration which is the great advantage bestowed upon us in our Baptism. So Didymus teaches in a later passage of the same book, where, nevertheless, he appears to attempt a discrimination between the blessing given in Baptism itself and the blessing which immediately follows it :—

"When we go down into the font, by the good pleasure of God the Father, we are stripped from our sins by the grace of His Spirit, putting off the old man, and by His royal power are begotten again and sealed. When we come up, we put on the Saviour Christ, the imperishable and equally to be honoured robe of the Holy Spirit who begat us again and sealed us, and we recover again the image and likeness of God of which Scripture speaks, which we received by the Divine inbreathing and lost through the fall, and we are again found such as we were in the days of the first man, unfallen and with full power over ourselves." [2]

It is curious to see how in this passage Didymus ascribes not only regeneration but also sealing to the font itself, and yet makes the attainment of the

[1] *De Trin.* II. vii. 6. [2] *Ibid.* II. xii.

image and likeness of God to be imparted by the subsequent "putting on" of the Spirit. The fact is —and it is of singular interest—that Didymus is in this passage strongly influenced by recollections of the work of Tertullian upon Baptism. So far as I am aware, no other Greek author shows signs of being acquainted with that work; but Didymus, throughout his disquisition on Baptism and its bearing on the doctrine of the Spirit, evinces a full and verbal knowledge of Tertullian's book, though he does not mention it.[1] It is remarkable, however, that with Tertullian's teaching in his mind, and Tertullian's language upon his lips, Didymus should be entirely silent about the Laying on of Hands, transferring what Tertullian derives through that rite, to the Unction which had encroached upon it.

Like the African Father, S. Didymus sees a type of Baptism in the troubled pool of Bethesda:—

"The angel also which troubled the water was a forerunner of the Holy Ghost; and, like him, John was both called the angel of the Lord, and was forerunner of the Master, and baptized in the waters. And the unction (*χρίσμα*) with which Aaron was anointed by Moses, and not Aaron only, but also all who were anointed from the priestly horn, and were surnamed from the unction 'Anointed ones' (*χριστοί*), bore a type of the consecrated Unction received by us. For although this takes place in a bodily manner, the benefit none the less is a benefit to the soul.

[1] Tertullian seems to have written his book in Greek first, and the Latin was somewhat abridged from it (*De Bapt.* § 15).

Only let the faith of the thrice-blessed Trinity come into our hearts, and the spiritual word into our mouths, and the seal of Christ upon our foreheads,—only let Baptism receive us, and the Unction confirm us (ῥώσῃ),—and at once the Trinity, which by nature is a giver of good things, is found to be propitious; at once the Trinity comes to us; in that very moment the unclean spirits withdraw from those who are now clean; immediately earthly things are passed away, and all the various passions of the body are removed to a distance. . . . In many passages,—not least in speaking of Holy Baptism—the Scripture, because of the identity of nature and activity between the Holy Ghost and the Father and Son, is observed to mention only the Holy Ghost and His saving sign, whereby being sealed we are reconstituted into the original image. The sheep which is not sealed is an easy prey to wolves, not having the aid (συμμαχίαν) which comes from the Seal, and not being known as others are by the Good Shepherd, since it, for its part, does not know the Pastor of all."[1]

[1] *De Trin.*, II. xiv., xv. For the parallel language of Tertullian see above, p. 60. Didymus goes on to argue from this that Eunomians and others, who do not believe in the Trinity, must be baptized when they come over; and adds, "From whatever heresy it may be, those who come over are anointed, since they do not possess the holy Unction. A bishop alone, by the grace from above, duly makes (τελεῖ) the Unction." Mr. Gore *Church and the Ministry* p. 138, note 2 (1st edit.) appears to suppose that this passage of Didymus contradicts the well-known words of the Ambrosian Hilary, *apud Aegyptum presbyteri consignant si praesens non sit episcopus.* There is, however, no contradiction. Hilary does not say that the presbyters *consecrate* the chrism; Didymus does not say that the bishop alone can *seal* with it. His expression τελεῖν τὸ χρίσμα can hardly be equivalent to τελεῖν τὴν χρίσιν. Compare the language of S. Leo, on p. 185.

In this way Didymus, who in the earlier passages which I have cited betrays a consciousness of composite elements in the baptismal sacrament, adopts, though in less trenchant and vigorous words, Tertullian's view of the preparatory nature of the baptismal immersion. The "angel" of the baptismal water stands to the Holy Ghost as John did to Christ. Then, in the sacerdotal Unction which follows,—still a part of Baptism,—we are "confirmed," and, it is implied, we are confirmed by the coming of the Holy Ghost.

In the next famous teacher of the Egyptian Church to whom we have to turn—Isidore of Pelusium, at the close of the fourth and beginning of the fifth century—there is no direct mention of Confirmation, in any form, as practised in his own day.[1] Curiously enough, in the impressive account which once or twice over he gives of the benefits of Baptism, S. Isidore does not speak of the gift of the Holy Ghost. By Baptism, our nature "not only is delivered from punishment, and puts off all wickedness"—this Isidore calls a "minimising doctrine" (*σμικρολογεῖν*)—"but is born again from above—a Divine regeneration, and passing expression, as if from some mechanical contrivance (*ὥσπερ ἐκ μηχανῆς τινός*), having been devised for us—and is redeemed, and sanctified, and brought to adoption, and justified, and becomes fellowheir of the Only-begotten,

[1] Unless it be in *Epist.* i. 26, where *τὰς χειροθεσίας τῆς μυσταγωγίας* seems a strange expression for Ordination. Such, nevertheless, seems distinctly to be the meaning.

and is made to be of one body with Him through participation of the holy mysteries, and is reckoned as His flesh, and is united with Him as the body with the head."[1] By means of Baptism, Christ "has made our bodies less heavy, waking them to rise by the wing of the Spirit."[2] Isidore makes no attempt to resolve Baptism, as given in his time, into its constituents.[3] Yet when he deals with the discipline of the earlier time, he makes no difficulty about the division of one baptismal gift from another. In answer to a correspondent who confused the deacon Philip with his apostolic namesake, Isidore says:—

"If the person who baptized (the Samaritan converts) had been one of the Apostles, he would have had the power of bestowing the Spirit. He baptizes only as a disciple, and the grace is completed by the Apostles, to whom the power of so bestowing had been given."[4]

This simple language is all the more remarkable, because Isidore was a disciple of S. Chrysostom, if not by personal intercourse, at least by his writings; and S. Chrysostom, as we shall see presently,[5] attempts a different explanation.

[1] *Epist.* iii. 195. Compare iv. 168, where he again uses his strange ὥσπερ ἐκ μηχανῆς. The "holy mysteries" probably mean the Eucharist, not Baptism.

[2] *Epist.* iv. 204.

[3] The same is true of his contemporary and countryman, Mark the Hermit, whose works contain a powerful set of answers to questions on Baptism. Mark asserts in the strongest terms the gift of the Spirit in Baptism, but nowhere defines what he means by Baptism (Migne *Patrol. Graec.* lxv. p. 985).

[4] *Epist.* i. 450.

[5] See below, p. 365.

Among those who called themselves by the title of "sons" to S. Isidore was his ecclesiastical chief, the Patriarch Cyril. Cyril follows Didymus in his division of the benefits conferred by Holy Baptism upon soul and body respectively.

"Our Lord Jesus Christ described the new birth of the Spirit as being 'from above,' thus showing the Spirit to be of that essence which is above all essences, through whom we are made partakers of the Divine nature, inasmuch as we enjoy that which essentially proceeds from that nature, and through it and in it are transferred back to the beauty of our original pattern, being thus brought forth afresh to newness of life, and fashioned anew to the Divine adoption. . . . For since man is by nature a composite and not a single thing, made of two things mixed together, a material body and an immaterial soul, a twofold treatment is needed for his regeneration, in alliance with both those constituent parts. By the Spirit the spirit of man is hallowed; by water—hallowed water—his body. For as the water that is poured into caldrons, by converse with the energies of the fire, absorbs its power, so through the operation of the Spirit the material water is transelemented (*ἀναστοιχειοῦται*) to a kind of Divine inexpressible power, so as thereupon to hallow any in whom it comes to be (*ἐν οἷς ἂν γένοιτο*)."[1]

I cannot say that it is very clear what S. Cyril exactly thought to be the advantage of this transelementation of the baptismal water. Does he mean

[1] *In Ioann.* II. i. (p. 147 Aubert).

that the transelementation is the reason why the hallowed water is now able to hallow the material body of man? Such appears to be the most literal explanation of his language. In spite of the metaphysical change which has come over the water, the benefits of its application belong to the body, while the human spirit is hallowed otherwise, by the Spirit of God. And yet Cyril appears, in the last words of the passage quoted, almost to identify the transelemented water with the communication from the Divine nature which passes into the soul to regenerate it, for he speaks of it as coming to be "in" the baptized, which can scarcely be said of the sacramental water. In any case, however, he regards the body as being peculiarly benefited by the baptismal water, while the gift of the Spirit benefits the soul.

Leaving for the moment the question whether the Spirit was supposed to be given concurrently with and by means of the baptismal water, or by a separate action, S. Cyril makes it plain in other passages, as well as in this, that he identified baptismal regeneration with the receiving of the Spirit of God. Thus he writes:

"In the days of John and from that time forward the giving of the Spirit and the regeneration unto God through Holy Baptism is violently seized through faith."[1]

Or more strongly,

"Christ therefore says that John himself was not so great as the least in the kingdom of heaven (that

[1] *Thesaur. Assert.* xi. *ad fin.* (p. 106).

is, as one newly baptized but not yet possessing any distinction actually achieved by deeds) on this ground only, that the blessed Baptist was one born of woman, but the baptized has been born of God, according as it is written, and has become partaker of the Divine nature, having the Holy Ghost dwelling within him, and already bearing the title of a temple of God."[1]

It is of a piece with the inability to distinguish between the two modes of the Divine communication, the quickening touch and the personal indwelling, that S. Cyril finds himself compelled to minimise the Pentecostal outpouring of the Holy Ghost in order to be able to assign any value to the Paschal inbreathing.

"Therefore they received, indeed, the participation of the Holy Ghost when He breathed upon them, saying, 'Receive Holy Ghost,' for it was not possible for Christ to lie when He spoke, nor would He have said, 'Receive,' if He did not give. But in the days of the holy Pentecost, God would make more conspicuous the declaration of His grace and the manifestation of the Holy Ghost who (on the former occasion) had been made to dwell in them, and so tongues, like as of fire, appeared, not signifying a beginning of the gift in them, but indicating rather a beginning of speech . . . You see how they began to speak, not to be hallowed, and that a distribution of tongues has come down upon them,—itself the work of the Spirit that was in them."[2]

[1] *In Ioann.* v. (p. 475).
[2] *Ibid.* xii. (p. 1099).

This Divine indwelling is definitely conveyed by "Baptism":—

"The circumcision of the heart is, according to the language of Paul, in the Spirit. But the circumcision in the Spirit could not take place in us, if the Holy Ghost had not been made to dwell in us by means of faith on the one hand and Holy Baptism on the other. . . . Therefore also we exclude from the holy Table men who actually know Christ's Godhead, and have already confessed the faith,—that is, those who are still catechumens but have not yet been enriched by the possession of the Holy Ghost; for He does not dwell in those who are not yet baptized."[1]

Yet with all this feeling of the solidarity of Baptism and its effects, Cyril finds room for more than one sacramental movement in the gracious work. It is not by Baptism in the modern and restricted sense that this regenerative indwelling is bestowed. Thus commenting upon the "sure water" promised by Isaiah, Cyril says:—

"For indeed to those who dwell in the Church . . . a sure water is given, namely that of the Holy Baptism, which makes (*ἀποφαῖνον*) those to whom it is vouchsafed sure and steadfast. For the grace of the Holy Ghost is given to those who have been cleansed (*τοῖς κεκαθαρμένοις*) through Holy Baptism; and those who have received it, he says, shall see the King in His beauty."[2]

[1] *In Ioann.* xii. (p. 1084).

[2] *In Esai.* iii. 3 (p. 460). The printed text has *βαπτίσματος* twice over in the last sentence; but it is evident that in the first place of the two it ought to be corrected to *πνεύματος*. The word *ἀποφαίνειν*

Here, though it is the "sure water" of Baptism which makes the recipient "sure and steadfast," it does so by virtue of a second process, not by the first. First comes a cleansing, to which the name of Holy Baptism in the narrower sense belongs; then follows the giving of the grace of the Holy Ghost, which makes us sure and steadfast. And yet, because of the unity of all the parts of the baptismal sacrament, the giving of the grace of the Holy Ghost itself also is a factor in the "sure water of Holy Baptism."

Nor does S. Cyril, any more than others, leave us in doubt, what was the nature of that second action in Baptism, by which those who have been cleansed are made sure and steadfast.

"It should be observed that the promise (Joel ii. 23, 24) is true also in the way of mystical fulfilment. We have been given, as it were in rain, the living water of Holy Baptism; and as in wheat, the Bread of Life; and as in wine, the Blood. And the use of oil, moreover, is foreshown as well, which contributes to the perfecting of those who are in process of being justified in Christ through Holy Baptism (*συντελοῦσα πρὸς τελείωσιν τοῖς δικαιουμένοις ἐν Χριστῷ διὰ τοῦ ἁγίου βαπτίσματος*)."[1]

Like Didymus, also,—perhaps from him, as Jerome did[2]—Cyril had learned to interpret of the baptismal Unction such passages as that in which Isaiah predicts the feast which was one day to be given to all nations in the Catholic Church :—

with its synonyms is constantly used in ecclesiastical Greek for "to make."

[1] *In Ioel* p. 224.

[2] Hieron. *Comment. in loc.*

"The ointment might exceedingly well signify to us the anointing of the Holy Ghost. For the wise John writes, 'And ye have an unction from the Holy One, and have no need that one teach you, but as His unction teacheth you concerning all things.' For we are copiously anointed with ointment during the very time of Baptism (*κατὰ τὸν καιρὸν μάλιστα τοῦ βαπτίσματος*), making the Unction a symbol of receiving the impartition (*μεταλαχεῖν*) of the Holy Ghost." [1]

If, therefore, S. Cyril speaks of the Holy Ghost's indwelling as given to us in Baptism, or even in the water of Baptism, we must understand him to mean in that Unction which was to him essentially one with the baptismal water.

I may add that it seems as if S. Cyril might dispute with S. Athanasius the honour of being the last Alexandrian Father to recognise in the closing ceremonies of Baptism, as administered in his day, the rite of Imposition of the Hand which was prescribed by the ancient Constitutions of his Church; though it meant to him a different gesture from that which was assuredly at first intended. The thing signified by it is the same to him as to earlier authors,—the gift of the indwelling Spirit.

[1] *In Esai.* iii. 1 (p. 353.) It is not quite clear what exact shade of meaning is to be given here to the word *μάλιστα*. Usage would justify us in giving almost opposite translations—either "just at the time of Baptism," "at the time of Baptism, of all others," or else, "at the time of Baptism or thereabouts." I prefer the former. The tense of the word *μεταλαχεῖν* is not to be understood as equivalent to *μετειληχέναι*, "as a symbol of having already received;" it expresses the act simultaneous with the unction.

"'And Aaron lifted up his hands and blessed the people.' See again, I pray you, Imposition of Hands upon the people used for the first time by Aaron. For the true Aaron blesses all alike, priests and people, the small with the great, as it is written, all but laying His hands upon them. And this laying on of hands may serve as a clear prefiguration of the injection of the Allholy Ghost into us. But before Aaron's sacrifice there was no laying on of hands; for 'there was no Spirit,' according to John's expression, 'because that Jesus was not yet glorified.'"[1]

After the time of S. Cyril the famous Church to which he belonged fell into the Monophysite heresy, for which he had himself helped to prepare the way; and with the heresy and consequent schism came a rapid decline in intellectual and literary power. It will not be necessary to examine for our present purpose the language of the unimportant writers belonging to the later ages of the effete Alexandrian Church. In what we have seen of the opinions of the teachers of its Catholic period there is a strong typical resemblance. Certain features constantly recur in their teaching,—for instance, the thought of restoration by Baptism to the state of Adam unfallen,[2] and the identity of regeneration with the gift of the indwelling Spirit. Without being fanciful, we may observe that the history of the doctrine of that Church upon the various baptismal rites and graces runs, in

[1] *De Adorat.* xi. p. 404.

[2] This is a specially favourite thought with Cyril; see for instances *in Ioann.* pp. 147, 180, 471, 822, 988, 1096.

a kind of way, parallel to the history of its doctrine upon the still more important subject of our Lord's person. Though the three main rites of Baptism preserve their distinct existence for a longer time at Alexandria than elsewhere in the East,—the Laying on of Hands being witnessed to, as I believe, by Athanasius if not by Cyril,—yet the distinction between the blessings respectively vouchsafed through them becomes less and less easy to trace. They become blurred and confused in one general effect. The unity of Baptism is at last maintained at the cost of its rich variety. And yet it in no wise appears that this result was reached, in S. Cyril's time, by transferring back to Baptism, in the restricted sense, the blessing belonging to Confirmation; rather, if anything, the contrary. The special blessings of Baptism in the restricted sense are spoken of as blessings which mainly affect the body—though even these, perhaps, are regarded as waiting for others to follow before they become effective. It is only when Baptism has been completed by the attendant rites that the one great object is attained, and the man is regenerate by virtue of the indwelling of the Spirit, and is sealed with the likeness of the Creator.

APPENDIX II.

THE BAPTISMAL OFFICES OF THE COPTIC CHURCH.

Asseman, in the first three volumes of his *Codex Liturgicus*, gives the form used by the Coptic Churches of Egypt and Abyssinia, (1) in preparation for Holy Baptism, (2) in Baptism itself, and (3) in Confirmation.

1. In these, a tendency is observable, as elsewhere, to draw back to preliminary rites some of the benefits of the sacrament itself. Thus the prayers in exorcizing the "oil of the catechumens" contemplate a change in the oil similar to that which S. Cyril ascribes to the baptismal water :—

"Transform and change it, and make it an anointing oil, and an oil of the catechumenate, which may make the soul faithful[1] in Jesus Christ."

Its effect is further described thus :—

"That it may be an oil of catechumenate, and a safeguard against all the works of the enemy, and against all witchcraft and incantation and idolatry, and may turn back every evil work."

With this oil the catechumen is anointed on the forehead, heart, and shoulders, in the name of the Holy Trinity, and "in the one, holy, catholic, and apostolic Church of God."

Presently the priest lays his hands upon the catechumen, saying—

[1] There is a technical significance in the word here.

"In the name of the only begotten Son Jesus Christ I cleanse and prepare this body. In the name of the only begotten Son Jesus Christ let it be freed from all devils; let all darkness flee from this body, and every thought of unbelief flee from this soul."

Then follows the renunciation, and breathing on the face, or exsufflation of the evil spirit; then the confession of the faith, and more prayers for a right preparation.

After this, a fresh unction and a fresh imposition of the hand; the former accompanied by the words—

"I anoint thee with the oil of gladness, a safeguard against all the works of the malignant enemy, that thou mayest be grafted into the stock of the olive tree, which is the holy, catholic, and apostolic Church of God. Amen."

The latter is accompanied by more prayers of the same kind as before.[1]

2. Immediately after this admission to the catechumenate, according to Asseman,—though no doubt at an earlier period there was an interval between,—follows the strictly baptismal office. The former ceremonies took place elsewhere; but now the priest enters the baptistry. After several lections, and long intercessory prayers for the Church and country, and for the candidates, the priest prays over the font,

"Send forth Thy holy power upon this Baptism, to strengthen Thy servant, and to give him such dispositions, that he may be able to receive the holy Baptism of Regeneration for the remission of his sins, and for the hope which cannot be lost."

Next comes an imposition of hands; and after certain intercessions, and the recitation of the Creed, holy oil is poured into the font, and the prayer of consecration begins; in which God is besought thus:—

"Sanctify this water, and this oil, that they may be for

[1] Assem. *Cod. Lit.* vol. i. p. 141 foll.

a laver of regeneration (Amen), for eternal life (Amen), for an incorruptible garment (Amen), for adoption of sons (Amen), for renewing of the Holy Ghost (Amen). For Thine only begotten Son, our Lord Jesus Christ, who descended into Jordan and cleansed the waters thereof, testified and said, 'Except a man be born again of water and the Holy Ghost, he cannot enter into the kingdom of heaven,' and He commanded His holy disciples and pure Apostles, saying, 'Go ye, teach all nations, and baptize them (✠) in the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Ghost.' Enter into us, Almighty; save us, O Holy One, (*cry aloud*) O God the Father Almighty, over this water, that through it, and through Thy Holy Spirit, by Thy Divine power Thou mayest regenerate Thy servant, who has offered himself. Give him remission of sins and the garment that doth not decay."

After this comes the kiss of peace, while anthems are sung, and then the *Dominus vobiscum* and the *Sursum corda* introduce the thanksgiving, which gathers up all the mystical teaching about water in the Old Testament, and passes on into the great invocation of the Spirit upon the water,

"That all who are to be baptized therein may put off the old man which is corrupt according to the deceitful lusts, and may put on the new man which is renewed after the image of his Creator; and that the light of Thy truth may shine in them through the Holy Ghost; and that they may enjoy eternal life and a blessed hope, and when they stand before Thee at the tribunal of Christ, they may obtain the heavenly glory and the remission of their sins."

Then the priest takes the chrism and pours it thrice upon the water; and after several beautiful anthems, while the people sing words commemorative of the Baptism of Christ, the priest plunges the candidate thrice in the water in the sacred name, and breathes upon his face.

Immediately after this the priest says a prayer for the deconsecration of the waters.

"Sovereign Lord God, who hast made all things of nothing through Thy true wisdom, Thou from the beginning didst gather the waters together in one place, and didst order all creatures according to the infinite greatness of Thy power and understanding; Thou, O our Sovereign Lord, by the grace of Thy Christ and by the descent of Thy Holy Spirit, hast consecrated this water, whereby it hath been made to Thy servant baptized therein a laver of regeneration, and a renewal after his former error, and thereby he hath been enlightened with the light of Thy Divinity. We pray and beseech Thee, O loving One and kind to man, that thou wouldest transmute this water to its former nature, that it may turn again to earth as it was before."

And with a short ascription of praise, the service passes on directly to the Confirmation.[1]

3. "*The priest holds the vessel containing the holy chrism, and prays over it before the altar:—*

'O Lord who alone art Almighty, and doest all wondrous things, and nothing is impossible unto Thee, O Lord, but Thy power is effectual in all at Thy good pleasure; bountifully bestow the Holy Ghost through the unction of the holy Chrism; that it may be to Thy servant a life-giving seal, and strength and confirmation, through Thine only begotten Son Jesus Christ our Lord.'

"*Then anoint the forehead of the baptized with the holy chrism, and his eyes, saying thus:*

'In the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Ghost. The unction of the grace of the Holy Ghost. Amen.'

"*Anoint his nose and mouth, saying,*

'The unction of the earnest of the kingdom of heaven. Amen.'

[1] Assem. vol. ii. p. 150 foll.

"*Then anointing his ears, say,*

'The unction of partaking of eternal life and immortality. Amen.'

"*Anoint his hands within and without, and say,*

'The holy unction of Christ our God, and His inviolable seal. Amen.'

"*Anoint his heart, saying,*

'The perfection of the grace of the Holy Ghost, and the shield of faith and righteousness. Amen.'

"*Anointing his knees, the soles of his feet, his back, arms, and shoulders, and before his heart, say,*

'I anoint thee, N. N., with holy oil; in the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Ghost. Amen.'

"*After this, lay thy hand upon him and say,*

'Be thou blessed with the blessing of the heavenly ones and with the blessing of angels. The Lord Jesus Christ bless thee in His own name.'

"*Here breathe upon his face in the form of the glorious cross.*

'Receive the Holy Ghost; and be thou a clean vessel, through Jesus Christ our Lord, to whom is the glory, with His good Father and the Holy Ghost, now and ever.'

"*Then let the baptized be clothed in white garments, and let the priest say,*

'The raiment of incorruptible and immortal eternal life. Amen.'

"*Deacon.* 'Let us pray to the Lord.'

"*Priest.* 'O Sovereign Lord God Almighty, Father of our Lord God and Saviour Jesus Christ, who hast vouchsafed to Thy servant to be born again by the washing of regeneration, and the doing away of his sins, and hast given him the incorruptible raiment and the grace of adoption; do thou also, O sovereign Lord, send forth now upon him Thy Holy Ghost. Make him a partaker of eternal life and immortality, that according as Thy only begotten

Son, our Lord God and Saviour, Jesus Christ, hath promised to him that is born again of water and the Holy Ghost, he may be able to enter into the kingdom of heaven, through the name, and power, and grace of the same Thy only begotten Son Jesus Christ our Lord.'

"*After this are sung the following anthems in honour of the baptized.*

'Jesus Christ, the Son of God the Father, hath filled thee with strength and grace, O blessed child, who hast received the holy Baptism. Worthy (*thrice*) is such a Christian.

'Receive the Comforter Spirit and heavenly benediction through the unction of the holy Chrism, O blessed child. Worthy (*thrice*) is such a Christian.

'Receive mercy, hope and faith, and grace from Christ the only begotten, O blessed child. Worthy (*thrice*) is such a Christian.'"

Then follows the ceremony of crowning, corresponding to the "mystical covering" which we have seen to be used in the Western rite, and the loins of the baptized are girded crosswise, and then follow more anthems of the same kind, to each of which the people respond with the cry, "Worthy is such a Christian."

"Receive the Holy Ghost, O thou that hast been baptized with holy Baptism. Worthy is Jesus Christ the Son of God the Father, who hath girded thee with strength and grace, O blessed child, who hast received the holy Baptism.

"Receive the Comforter Spirit and heavenly benediction, O blessed child.

"Receive the Spirit of God, who hath filled thee with a good will.

"Receive the Spirit of gladness from the King that reigneth.

"Receive the Spirit of exultation from Emmanuel our God.

"Receive the Spirit full of glory from Christ the King of glory.

"Thou hast received grace and blessing through our Lord Jesus Christ.

"Thou hast been made the abode of the Holy Ghost, a golden crown, a silver crown, a crown of rock of pearl."

After this follows the Communion, which is given to the newly baptized, with another imposition of the hand, and a prayer which once more recounts the graces already bestowed :—

"Blessed art Thou, O Sovereign Lord God Almighty, Father of our Lord God and Saviour Jesus Christ, who hast counted Thy servant worthy of the washing of regeneration, and remission of sins, the incorruptible garment, and the precious earnest of Thy glorious kingdom, and the gift of Thy Holy Spirit. We pray and beseech Thee, O Lover of men, that Thou wouldest count him worthy to partake of the holy Body and venerable Blood of Thy Christ, and bountifully bestow this sure grace upon him, that he may finish his fight according to Thy bidding, and observe Thy holy commandments, and may win the bliss of the saints and the kingdom of heaven, through the grace," etc.

How absolutely one Confirmation was with Baptism in the minds or those who gradually formed this office, is seen incidentally in one of the concluding *Encomia*, where it says—

"Rejoice, O brethren, Christ's faithful, and be glad of the grace Divine, which your children have obtained, the grace of holy Baptism, and of the receiving of the Divine mysteries, that is, the Body and Blood of the only begotten Son." [1]

In this retrospect, as is very often the case in prospect, Confirmation no longer stands out as a thing by itself.

[1] Assem. vol. iii. p. 82 foll.

The neophyte has received two sacraments, first Baptism, and then the Eucharist. The notion that Confirmation is a separate sacrament appears to be entirely unknown. But no one can read through the prolix involutions and repetitions of the office without seeing that it is in Confirmation that the Baptism reached its climax. So far is this Alexandrian liturgy from conceiving of Confirmation as an ornamental ceremony, or even as adding a special increase and development to a gift of the Spirit already bestowed in Baptism itself, that it never suggests any rudiment of such a gift in Baptism itself, while it heaps up prayer upon prayer and anthem upon anthem to indicate that the Holy Ghost is given in the Unction (and Laying on of Hands) which followed.

Asseman does not say what is the date of the manuscript from which he prints this office, nor would the date of the manuscript do more than fix the lowest period at which the office could possibly have been framed. Its main lines, however, are still those of the directions for Baptism in the Egyptian Constitutions, though it follows the natural tendency of making the Chrism assume greater proportions in relation to the Laying on of Hands.

It is very interesting to observe in this connexion that Asseman prints[1] a Coptic form of Baptism (and Confirmation) which contains no unctions, either before or after Baptism. He is of opinion that the form was never authorised nor used. It represents an attempt to reform and shorten the tremendous length of the received service, which attempt is justified in a long preface. In this shortened form, the two parts of the baptismal sacrament are more run together than in any other form with which I am acquainted. Not only the gift of the Spirit, not only regeneration (which so many of the Fathers teach to be consequent upon the gift of the Spirit), not only eternal

[1] Vol. ii. p. 183 foll.

life (as in the received office), but even remission of sins itself still waits to be bestowed in the Laying on of Hands.

A singular trace of the close association of Laying on of Hands with Baptism in the Alexandrian Church occurs in one of the *Encomia* upon S. John the Baptist at the close of the usual order of Baptism, where it is said :

"Hail, John the son of Zacharias, who wast accounted worthy to lay thy hand upon the head of our gracious Saviour."[1]

Asseman gives also another order of Confirmation from an Ethiopic source, slightly varying from the Coptic order. Doctrinally it presents scarcely any variation. Here, as in the other, God is acknowledged to have granted to the candidates in the Baptism itself "the washing of regeneration and forgiveness of sins (Amen) and the garment undefiled (Amen)," and is besought to "send forth upon them the Holy Ghost the Comforter," and to "make them partakers of eternal life." Only the prayer goes on (as if this had not already been said to have taken place), "that in the hope of Thine only Son Jesus Christ our Lord God and Redeemer they may be born again of water and the Holy Ghost, and may enter into the kingdom of heaven." Perhaps it may mean "that as they *have* been born again of water, they *may* be born of the Spirit." This would accord with some ancient teaching; but perhaps it is simpler to suppose that the whole spiritual value of Baptism was thought to hang suspended until the completion was reached in the Unction and Laying on of Hands.

[1] Assem. vol. iii. p. 99.

CHAPTER V.

THE OTHER EASTERN CHURCHES.

In speaking of the *Teaching of the Twelve Apostles*, I have already remarked that the directions there given for the administration of Holy Baptism contain no reference to Confirmation in any form, whether by unction, or by laying on of hands, or by sealing with the cross; and I have suggested as the reason for this omission, that the manual known by that name was not a manual intended for those who were empowered to bestow Confirmation, but only for those inferior ministers who were bound to wait for the completion of their baptisms until the arrival of the Apostle or the Prophet. Such a supposition seems not unreasonable, in view of the discipline used at Samaria, as described by S. Luke, when we remember within how short a distance of time, and probably of place also, from the occurrence there related, this work was put together. Further support for this opinion is to be found when we turn to the account of Christian baptisms given by Justin Martyr,—the first Oriental writer, away from Alexandria, whose writings must engage our attention. The First Apology of Justin was addressed to Antoninus Pius, and was written in

or about the year 148. In this he describes the method of initiation into the Christian Church.

"As many as are persuaded and believe that these things which are taught and said by us are true, and promise that they are able to live thus, are taught to pray and ask God with fasting for the forgiveness of their former sins, while we pray and fast with them. Then they are led by us where there is water, and are regenerated after the same manner of regeneration with which we ourselves were regenerated. For they then make their bath in the water in the name (ἐπ' ὀνόματος) of God the Father and Lord of all, and of our Saviour Jesus Christ, and of the Holy Ghost. For Christ said, 'Except ye be regenerated, ye shall not enter into the kingdom of heaven.' . . . We learned from the Apostles the following reason for this. Since we have received our first birth without our knowledge or consent . . . and have fallen into vicious customs and evil modes of education, therefore, in order that we may not remain children of necessity nor of ignorance, but of free will and understanding, and may obtain forgiveness of what sins we committed before, the name of God, the Father and Lord of all, is named in the water over him who chooses to be regenerated and repents for his sins, no other description (of God) being given by him who leads the man who is about to wash to the laver. . . . This laver is called 'enlightenment,' because those who learn these things have their minds enlightened. I should add that the person enlightened washes also in the name of Jesus Christ who was crucified under Pontius

Pilate, and in the name of the Holy Ghost who through the prophet proclaimed beforehand all things concerning Jesus."[1]

It does not appear that S. Justin understood much more by the "regeneration" conveyed in such a baptism than forgiveness and freedom. But it is a mistake to suppose that Justin's description of Baptism ends at this point. After a digression about the way in which Christian regeneration was counterfeited and attested by diabolical agency among the heathen, he continues:—

"But we, after thus washing the man who has been persuaded and has given his consent, lead him to those who are called brethren, where they are assembled, to join in common prayers both for ourselves, and for the newly enlightened, and for all others everywhere, with great intensity, in order that (ὅπως), having learned the truth, we may by God's mercy be found in deed also good members of society and keepers of the things commanded, in order that we may be saved with the eternal salvation. Each salutes the others with a kiss when the prayers cease. Then——"[2]

Justin proceeds with his famous description of the Christian Eucharist, presided over by the προεστὼς τῶν ἀδελφῶν, or head of the brethren, to which the newly baptized was admitted. As Justin, in the following chapter of the Apology, depicts the ordinary weekly assemblage of the Christians for the Eucharist, it is evident that throughout the passage quoted he is still dwelling on the mode of Christian initiation.

[1] *Apol.* I. § 61. [2] *Ibid.* § 65.

It may, therefore, well be supposed that the Confirmation of the newly enlightened is to be reckoned among those "prayers" on his behalf which are made, where the brethren are assembled with their head (who apparently was not at the actual christening), between the Baptism and the Communion.[1] Prayer is in Confirmation more than it is in other sacraments, and may be reckoned as belonging almost to the "matter" of it, not only to the "form"; so that S. Austin, as we have seen, can ask what else Confirmation is but prayer over a man.[2] S. Justin's "head of the brethren"—it may be observed—who, in celebrating the Eucharist, "gives thanks at length" (ἐπὶ πολύ)[3] and "according to his ability" (ὅση δύναμις),[4] appears to hold the same office as the "prophets" of the *Didache*, who are not to be bound by the rules laid down for the celebrant in that manual, but may "give thanks as fully as they please (ὅσα θέλουσιν)."[5] They would, therefore, doubtless have authority to confirm.

It will be convenient to take first in order, among Eastern documents which speak explicitly of Confirmation, the interesting collection called the *Apostolical Constitutions*. In their present form, as a whole, they are considered to belong approximately to the end of the third century;[6] but they contain materials of a

[1] I see that Saintebeuve makes the same suggestion (p. 61 foll. ed. 1778), to meet Daillé's argument from the silence of Justin.

[2] See above, p. 103. [3] *Apol.* § 65.

[4] *Ibid.* § 67. [5] *Doctr. XII Apost.* § 10.

[6] Bishop Lightfoot places them in the half century between Origen and Eusebius (*S. Ignatius* vol. i. p. 336, 1st edition).

much more primitive date, inextricably interwoven (for the most part) with later work. They probably emanate from the Church of Antioch. Aided by what we know to have been the case in other Churches, we may fairly conclude that much, at any rate, of the baptismal doctrine and discipline which they contain is to be classed with the more ancient materials of the fabric. In particular, the entire silence of Oriental teachers (other than Alexandrian) from the beginning of the fourth century onwards with regard to the Laying on of Hands as a living rite, would lead us to suppose that the passages in the *Apostolical Constitutions* which dwell upon that rite can hardly have been composed—nor would even have been transcribed from earlier manuals—much after the time of Origen. On the other hand, the immense importance attached to the rites of Unction—more especially of the unction before baptism—may be taken to indicate a later state of feeling. On the whole relation of the confirmatory rites to the baptismal, the *Apostolical Constitutions* are an evidence of the growth of Eastern feeling on the subject up to the age of Constantine.

What then do the *Apostolical Constitutions* say?

"If he who hath called a layman Raca or Fool is not without punishment, as having done despite to the law of Christ, what if a man should speak against a bishop? through whom the Lord gave the Holy Ghost (to dwell) in you in the Laying on of Hands (δι' οὗ τὸ ἅγιον πνεῦμα ὁ κύριος ἐν ὑμῖν ἔδωκεν ἐν τῇ χειροθεσίᾳ); through whom ye have learned the

sacred decrees, and have known God, and have believed in Christ; through whom ye were known by God; through whom ye were sealed with the oil of gladness and the ointment of understanding; through whom ye were declared sons of light; through whom the Lord in your enlightenment, bearing witness by the Laying on of the Hand of the bishop (ἐν τῷ φωτισμῷ ὑμῶν, τῇ τοῦ ἐπισκόπου χειροθεσίᾳ μαρτυρῶν), extended to each of you the sacred voice, saying, 'Thou art My son; this day have I begotten thee.' Through thy bishop God adopteth thee for His son, O man; recognise, O son, the right hand which is thy mother; love him who, after God, was thy father, and reverence him."[1]

This is the full doctrine of the holy Scripture, freely used and recombined. It is "in the Laying on of Hands" that the Holy Ghost is given in such a manner as to be "in" the Christian; but the Laying on of Hands is itself an incident "in the enlightenment," or Baptism. In the generous rhetoric of the passage there is no attempt to preserve the order in which the blessings administered by the bishop came; but it seems to be evidently intended—here,

[1] *Apost. Const.* II. 32. It is possible that τῇ τοῦ ἐπ. χειροθεσίᾳ μαρτυρῶν may be intended to mean "witnessing *to* the Laying on of Hands" (cf. Heb. ii. 4; Acts xv. 8). This, however, would have been more natural if the words following had, as in the Scriptures referred to, expressed some sensible mark of the Divine approval. The Laying on of Hands is apparently used, as in our English office, "to certify them by this sign" of their acceptance as God's children. It is interesting in this connexion to recall how Optatus saw in the same words of the Father, as used at the Baptism of Christ, an analogue of the Laying on of Hands (see above, p. 79).

perhaps, the doctrine is less purely Scriptural—that the full regeneration or adoption has not taken place until the baptized receives the "witness of the Laying on of the bishop's Hand."

The passage in the third book of the *Constitutions* prescribing the method of Baptism—or rather, the various parts to be performed in it by the various ministers—is one which is not a little confusing. After dwelling upon the need of deacons and deaconesses, and their qualifications, the writer goes on to say:

"And first, in the enlightening of women, the deacon shall only anoint their forehead with the holy oil, and after him the deaconess shall wipe them; for it is not necessary that the women should be gazed upon by men. But only in the laying on of hands shall her head be anointed by the bishop, in the way that the priests and kings were anointed of old. Not that those who are now baptized are ordained priests, but as Christians from the Christ, a royal priesthood and a holy nation, the Church of God, pillar and ground of the bridechamber, that once were not a people, but now beloved and chosen, upon whom His new name was called, as also the prophet Esaias witnesses, saying, 'And they shall call the people by His new name, which the Lord shall call him (or them).' Thou, therefore, O bishop, after this pattern shalt anoint the head of those who are undergoing Baptism, whether men or women, with the holy oil, for a figure of the spiritual baptism (*εἰς τύπον τοῦ πνευματικοῦ βαπτίσματος*). Then, either thou, the

bishop, or the priest under thee, speaking and naming over them the sacred invocation of Father and Son and Holy Ghost, shalt baptize them in the water; and let the deacon receive the man, and the deaconess the woman, in order that the impartition of the indestructible seal may be done with reverend seemliness, and after this let the bishop anoint the baptized with the ointment. The Baptism therefore is given into the death of Jesus; the water stands for (ἀντὶ) burial, the oil for the Holy Ghost, the seal for the cross; the ointment is a confirmation of the profession made; the Father is mentioned, as the author and sender; the Spirit is mentioned along with Him, as witness; the immersion is the dying with Christ, the emersion the rising with Him; the Father is the God who is over all; Christ is the only begotten God, the beloved Son, the Lord of glory; the Holy Ghost is the Paraclete, the Spirit sent by Christ, and taught of by Him, and proclaiming Him."[1]

Light is thrown upon the meaning of this passage by two others in a subsequent book where the baptismal process is set forth again from other points of view.

"Concerning Baptism, O bishop or presbyter," says one of these passages, modelled upon the parallel passage in the *Didache*, "we have already given instructions before, and now we say again that thou shalt go baptize as the Lord appointed unto us, saying, 'Go ye and make disciples of the nations, baptizing them into the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Ghost, teaching them to observe all things

[1] *Apost. Const.* III. 15–17.

that I have commanded you,'—of the Father who sent, of Christ who came, of the Paraclete who bore witness. But thou shalt anoint first with holy oil, then thou shalt baptize with water, and lastly, thou shalt seal with ointment; in order that the anointing (χρίσμα) may be a partaking of the Holy Ghost, the water a symbol of the death, and the ointment a seal of the covenants. But if there be neither oil nor ointment, water suffices alike for anointing and for seal, and for the profession of him who died, or indeed, who dies along with (Christ)."[1]

The other passage is more diffuse, and approaches the subject not so much from the ritual as from the didactic side.

"He who is about to be a catechumen in the doctrine of godliness, must be instructed before his baptism" in the knowledge of the Three Persons, creation, the moral discipline of God in history. "These and similar things let the postulant learn in the catechetical instruction; and let him who lays hands upon him worship God, the Lord of all, giving thanks" for the redemption of mankind. "And when the catechumen is now near to being actually baptized, let him learn" what he has to renounce, and what he has to agree to. "And after this promise, he comes next to the anointing of the oil. This oil is blessed by the high priest unto forgiveness of sins and preparation for Baptism. For he invokes thus the uncreated God, the Father of Christ, the King of every nature visible and invisible, that He would

[1] *Apost. Const.* VII. 22.

hallow the oil by the name of the Lord Jesus, and give (it) spiritual grace and effectual power, remission of sins and preparation of the confession of Baptism, so that he that is anointed, being released from all ungodliness, may be made worthy of the initiation according to the commandment of the Only-begotten. Thereupon, he comes to the water. The priest blesses and glorifies the Lord God Almighty, the Father of the Only-begotten God, with thanksgiving" for our redemption. "Let the priest call Him to the baptism and say, 'Look down out of heaven and sanctify this water, and give (it) grace and power, that he that is baptized according to the commandment of Thy Christ may be crucified with Him, and die and be buried with Him, and rise again with Him unto the adoption that is in Him, by being mortified to sin and living to righteousness.' And after this having baptized him in the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Ghost, let him anoint him with ointment, saying over him, 'O Lord God, made of none and subject to none, Lord of all, who hast provided the odour of the knowledge of the Gospel among all the nations to be a sweet odour, do Thou now also grant that this ointment may be effectual upon the person baptized, so that the sweet savour of Thy Christ may remain in him sure and durable, and that as he has died with Him, he may rise and live with Him.' These and similar things let him say; for this is the power of the Laying on of Hands upon each (ἑκάστου γὰρ ἡ δύναμις τῆς χειροθεσίας ἐστὶν αὕτη). For if some such invocation is not made upon each one of these

by the godly priest, he that is baptized does but go down into water, like the Jews, and puts away only the filth of the body, not the filth of the soul."[1]

A comparison of these passages shows, as Daillé has pointed out,[2] the presence of accretions upon the original baptismal discipline, as well as some distortion of the original baptismal doctrine. It is needless to say here that the book containing these directions is a book of no authority in the Church; and yet it can hardly represent a purely imaginary state of things. It probably describes customs with which the writer was locally familiar, and which he desired to see diffused. We see here—what indeed we have seen in the *Egyptian Constitutions*—an anointing before Baptism, as well as after, and a distinction between the matter of the unction in the two cases; only whereas in the *Egyptian Constitutions* the distinction consists (apparently) in a different consecration and title, in the *Apostolical Constitutions* there is a difference also of material. For the unction before Baptism, "holy oil" is used; for the subsequent unction, the ointment (*μύρον*)—that is, oil compounded

[1] *Apost. Const.* VII. 39–44. It might be possible to interpret the words *εἰς ἕκαστον τούτων*, "upon each of these elements,"—so that the meaning should be that if prayer be not used over the oil, the water, and the ointment respectively, the employment of them is only external and unspiritual. But the words immediately before preclude this interpretation. The *ἑκάστου* there can only mean "of each person confirmed"; and it would be very unnatural to make *εἰς ἕκαστον τούτων* refer to anything different from the *ἑκάστου*. Besides, the doctrine that Baptism uncompleted by Confirmation is spiritually ineffective is to be found elsewhere, though perhaps not so nakedly stated as here.

[2] *De Confirmatione* p. 180 foll.

with perfumes—is the correct element. At the same time, we have a most interesting glimpse opened out to us of the history of these rites, and of the essential difference between them and the primary rite of Baptism, in the free acknowledgement that where oil and ointment were not to be had, the baptismal water was sufficient to serve the purpose. It is curious also to observe—though it probably only concerns the preliminary unction—the exact opposite of the ritual of the West in S. Innocent's time. The deacon may anoint the forehead, but only the bishop (and, apparently, the priest) may anoint the head. Besides the various unctions, there are also various acts described as Laying on of Hands. The first of these (which was used also in the West, and was probably universal) was at the admission of a postulant to the rank of a catechumen. This might be performed, it seems, by any one—at any rate by any appointed catechist. Next it appears as if there were an imposition of hands accompanying the unction before Baptism—possibly corresponding to that "taking hold" of each one of the candidates prescribed in the *Egyptian Constitutions*—confined to the higher orders of the Church. Finally, the anointing with the ointment in Confirmation is accompanied by, or identified with, the Laying on of Hands whose paramount importance is recognised by all (*ἑκάστου ἡ δύναμις τῆς χειροθεσίας ἐστὶν αὕτη*).

On turning from the ritual of Baptism to the doctrine, the surprising thing is to see how, not only what is commonly associated with Confirmation, but

also what is commonly associated with Baptism itself, seems here to be carried back to the preparatory unction. No doubt we are here not dealing either with a great teacher, whose words have an authority of their own, nor yet with a recognised manual which has the authority of wide acceptance in the Church. Still, this adapter and embellisher of old documents and traditions is probably an exponent of thoughts which were shared by others. It is, therefore, a striking sign of the course of thought when we find him teaching steadily that, while the ointment (after Baptism) is "a confirmation of the profession made," and "a seal of the covenants," and effectual for retaining "the sweet savour of Christ sure and durable," the preparatory unction, on the other hand, is that which makes us like the priests and kings of old, "Christians from the Christ," bearing His new name; that it is "a figure of the spiritual Baptism;" that it "stands for the Holy Ghost," and is "a partaking of the Holy Ghost." It is even more striking that while Baptism itself is consistently treated as "given into the death of Jesus," and "standing for burial," "dying with Christ," "a symbol of the death," endowed with "grace and power that the baptized may be crucified with Him," the preparatory unction, on the other hand, is endowed with "spiritual grace and effectual power, remission of sins and preparation of the confession of Baptism," so that he that is anointed is "released from all ungodliness" and so "made worthy of the initiation."[1]

[1] The *Clementine Recognitions* appear to contemplate the same

But however surprising these developments may be, the setter forth of the *Apostolical Constitutions* still holds fast to primitive doctrine in several respects. Baptism is still for him one thing from first to last—the oil, the water, the seal, the ointment, and the laying on of hands. The last-named ceremony is still the predominant feature of that group of ceremonies which follows Baptism. Just as the unction before Baptism is, if we rightly understand the passage, an incident "in the laying on of hands" which occurs at that point,[1] so the invocation over the final ointment is "the force of the Laying on of Hands." And lastly, going far beyond Holy Scripture in his zeal for a scriptural belief, with an emphasis which perhaps surpasses anything to be found even in the *De Rebaptismate*, in spite of all that he has said about the preparatory unction, and of Baptism itself, the writer declares that without this invocation

kind of ideas; "Baptizabitur unusquisque uestrum in aquis perennibus nomine trinae beatitudinis inuocato super se, peruunctus primo oleo per orationem sanctificato, ut ita demum per haec consecratus possit percipere de sanctis" (lib. iii. c. 67). The parallel passage in the *Clementine Homilies* omits the reference to the preliminary unction.

[1] It may be suspected that the passage in iii. 15, beginning ἀλλὰ μόνον ἐν τῇ χειροθεσίᾳ is a working up of earlier language, originally applied to the unction after baptism. The phrase ἐν τῇ χειροθεσίᾳ is difficult to understand of any other laying on of hands than the great one. Besides those impositions of the hand which have been noticed in the text, and besides that used in Ordination, the *Apostolical Constitutions* mention the use of the rite in penance, and in ordinary benediction. From the description of the latter (viii. 37), the word appears not to have involved the notion of manual contact; it was sufficient to lift up the hand over those who were blessed. (Compare the words of Cyril Alex., quoted on p. 305.)

which gives force to the Laying on of Hands, the baptism is as carnal and unprofitable as the baptisms of the Jews.

It is not unnatural that at the place where the disciples were first called Christians, men should lay much stress upon the Christian interpretation of the name. Within some thirty years of Justin's first Apology, Theophilus, the learned man whom Eusebius places sixth in the list of Bishops of Antioch, thus defends himself against the scoffs still levelled at that name by the heathen.

"When you laugh at me, calling me a Christian, you do not know what you are saying. First, that which is 'anointed' (χριστόν) is sweet and serviceable, (εὔχρηστον) and not to be laughed at. What ship can be serviceable and seaworthy, unless it first be anointed? Or what tower or house is sightly and serviceable when it has not been anointed? What man on entering into this life, or when contending in the games, is not anointed with oil? What work can be comely and sightly, if it be not anointed and polished? Then, even the air and all that is under heaven is, in a kind of way, anointed with light and spirit, and do you not wish to be anointed with the oil of God? We, therefore, are called Christians on this account, because we are anointed with the oil of God."[1]

Naturally the Apologist does not take his heathen opponent further into the secrets of our religion, but the passage shews the kind of ideas which gathered

[1] *Ad Autol.* i. 12. The date of this work is about A.D. 180.

for the primitive Christian round the symbolism of the anointing.

We have already seen how Cornelius of Rome, some seventy years later, assumes that the contemporary successor of Theophilus at Antioch, Fabius, will agree with him that Novatian's baptism cannot have conferred upon him the gift of the Spirit, since it was not afterwards completed by the rites of Confirmation. In connexion with the same controversy, or rather with that which rose out of it, on the baptism of heretics, we again find East and West at one, in the correspondence between Cyprian of Carthage and Firmilian, Bishop of the Cappadocian Caesarea. Firmilian, who claims to represent many other bishops of Asia Minor, entirely identifies himself with Cyprian's position,—often using Cyprian's very language.

"Heretics," he says, "if they cut themselves off from the Church of God, can have no power or grace at all, since all power and grace is placed in the Church, in which preside elders who have the power both of baptizing, and of laying on the hand, and of ordaining. For as a heretic may not ordain, nor lay on the hand, so neither may he baptize, nor perform anything in a holy and spiritual manner, since he is an alien from the spiritual and divine holiness."[1]

"Forasmuch as Stephen, and those who think with him contend that forgiveness of sins and new birth can take place in the baptism of heretics, among whom they themselves confess that there is no Holy

[1] Ap. Cypr. *Epist.* lxxv. 7.

Ghost, let them consider and understand that there cannot be any spiritual birth without the Spirit; and accordingly the blessed Apostle Paul baptized again, with spiritual Baptism, those who had been baptized by John before the Holy Ghost was sent by the Lord, and so laid his hand upon them, that they might receive the Holy Ghost. . . . Was Paul less great than these bishops of to-day, that they should be able to give the Holy Ghost to heretics who come over by Imposition of the Hand alone, while Paul was not qualified to give the Holy Ghost to those baptized by John by Imposition of the Hand, without first having also baptized them with the Church's Baptism?"[1]

"What does Stephen mean by saying that those baptized among heretics have with them the presence and sanctity of Christ? If the Apostle does not lie when he says, 'As many of you as are baptized into Christ have put on Christ,' then surely he who is baptized into Christ there, has put on Christ. But if he has put on Christ, he could also have received the Holy Ghost who has been sent by Christ, and it is vain to lay the hand upon him on coming over that he may receive the Spirit,—unless they so divide the Spirit from Christ, as to let the heretics have Christ among them, but not the Holy Ghost."[2]

"If Baptism without availed in the name of Christ for purifying the man, the Laying on of the Hand might also have availed there in the name of the same Christ for receiving the Holy Ghost."[3]

Whatever gesture may have constituted "laying

[1] Ap. Cypr. *Epist.* lxxv. 8. [2] *Ibid.* 12. [3] *Ibid.* 18.

on of hands" for Firmilian—either in unction, or in uplifting of the hand for benediction, or in the normal manner,—he does not hesitate to recognise the African practice as the same with his own, and he attributes to it the same fulness of sacramental grace. He is the last Greek author, however, away from Alexandria,—except the anonymous compiler of the Constitutions,—who uses the Apostolic title for the rite, until the antiquarian revival many centuries later; and perhaps along with the disappearance of the title came some diminution of the doctrine.

We now pass to the divines of the Nicene century. Among these it may be worth while first to mention Eusebius, Bishop of the Caesarea in Palestine. He was, through Pamphilus, the repository of the lore of Origen, and there is no reason to doubt that here, as elsewhere, he was in agreement with him. Not that he has occasion anywhere to discuss the direct question before us; but in one or two places he gives us indications of the doctrine and practice of his Church.

Commenting upon the twenty-third Psalm, in which he interprets "the waters of rest" to mean Holy Baptism, with its assurance of pardon, he takes it for granted that the meaning of the "oil" is too well known to require explanation:—

"They know both the spiritual oil, with which their heads were anointed, and the strong drink which fortifies and does not weaken, and the mystical food set before us by Him who is at once our Shepherd and our Bridegroom. In these good things, he says,

let us enjoy ourselves, while those that trouble us are distressed and afflicted; because, he says, those who once were slaves, have had so great a change of fortune,—'Thou hast anointed my head with oil.'"[1]

Similarly he interprets the wine and ointment prophesied of by Isaiah:—"Figures and symbols of these have been delivered to us by the Evangelical Word, in the mysteries of the New Testament, through the mystical Chrism and the saving Blood."[2]

There is a singularly elaborate and lofty discussion in the *Demonstratio Evangelica* upon the symbolical meaning of the composite ointment or oil (μύρον) with which the Old Testament priests and kings and prophets were anointed. Eusebius only treats fully of the application of the type to Christ, but incidentally he speaks of our partial share in the same. The oil is, of course, the Holy Ghost; and there are various ways of partaking of Him.

"So that which Moses speaks of was a symbol of the Divine Spirit. There are diversities of gifts, but the same Spirit,—which he thought that priests and prophets ought above all men to be anxious to partake of, inasmuch as they are dedicated to God on behalf of all the people, and not for themselves alone."[3]

It is interesting to observe that Eusebius was far from confounding, as many greater theologians did, the successive gifts of the Holy Spirit, after the

[1] *Comment. in Psalm.* xxii. [2] *Comment. in Es.* xxv. 7.
[3] *Demonstr. Evang.* iv. 15. The whole passage is well worth reading.

Resurrection and after the Ascension. Not directly arguing the point, but shewing against the Semi-sabellian Marcellus the personal difference between the Spirit and the Son, he says:—

"If He breathed upon the disciples and said, 'Receive Holy Ghost,' we must not be ignorant that the breath was in a manner purificatory of the Apostles' souls, preparing and making them to be in fit condition to receive the Holy Ghost (ἐπιτηδείους αὐτοὺς παρασκευάζον τῆς τοῦ ἁγίου πνεύματος ὑποδοχῆς). For He is not said to have breathed 'into their face (nostrils),' nor 'the breath of life,'—nor indeed the Holy Spirit—as it is written concerning Adam, that God breathed into his face the breath of life,—but He is said first to have breathed, and thereupon to have said, 'Receive Holy Ghost.'"

It is true that Eusebius almost immediately adds that his statement is capable of modification:—

"The breath was, as I said, purificatory of the Apostles,—or indeed perhaps effectual to impart the Holy Ghost; for it may be taken either way."

But a little later he returns to the distinction and makes it plainer:—

"Then (after the Resurrection) He breathed upon them, and then He gave them some part of a gift of the Holy Ghost, namely that which gives the forgiveness of sins. For there are diversities of gifts, of which He bestowed upon them in part, then when He was present and with them. But afterwards, He filled them with a greater and more perfect power, concerning which, in the Acts of the Apostles He

said to them, 'Ye shall be endued with power from on high when the Holy Ghost is come upon you,' when also He promised that they should be baptized in Holy Spirit, which indeed He fulfilled, after His taking up, on the day of Pentecost, the Holy Ghost being sent to them in accordance with His utterances."[1]

The see of Jerusalem, which rose at the Council of Chalcedon to be a patriarchate, was in the time of Eusebius under the jurisdiction of his see of Caesarea. It is, therefore, not improper to interpret the language of Eusebius by the more explicit language of Cyril. His famous Catechetical Lectures were delivered in or about the year 347, when he was a presbyter of the age of thirty-two, seven or eight years after the death of Eusebius. In these lectures we have an invaluable example of the way in which the outlines of the faith were taught to candidates for Holy Baptism.

Naturally, the references to the doctrine of Baptism are rich and frequent.

"Great is the Baptism which lies before you,—the ransom for captives, the remission of misdeeds; the death of sin, the regeneration of the soul; the shining raiment, the holy indelible seal; the chariot to heaven, the enjoyment of Paradise, the conveyance of the kingdom, the gift of adoption."[2]

Such expressions are used beforehand of the sacrament as a whole; and indeed there is no single expression among them which might not with propriety be used of the first part of the sacrament by

[1] *De Eccles. Theol.* iii. 5. [2] *Procat.* § 16.

itself.[1] But S. Cyril soon makes it apparent that the sacrament is a composite one, including several rites and varied benefits. For instance, he is fond of emphasizing the difference (emphasized, as we have seen, by Origen) between the baptism of water and the spiritual grace.

"Simon the sorcerer once came to the laver. He was baptized, but not enlightened. He dipped his body in water, but did not enlighten his heart by the Spirit. And his body went down and came up, but his soul was not buried with Christ, nor rose with Him."[2]

He warns his catechumens that if they come without better dispositions,

"The water will receive thee, but the Spirit will not accept thee (δέξεται, ἀποδέξεται)."[3]

Some might suppose from these words, that Cyril thought of water and the Spirit as the sign and the thing signified in Baptism respectively: and a passage in a later lecture, upon the subject of the sacrament, at first confirms that impression:—

"Each one of you is about to be presented before God, in the presence of ten thousand armies of angels. The Holy Ghost is about to seal your souls; you are about to be enrolled in the army of the great King;

[1] Even the σφραγὶς appears to be applied by Cyril to the first part of Baptism, though it is doubtful whether under that title he refers to the actual immersion in the water, considered as conferring an indelible character upon the soul, or whether he refers to a signing which accompanied the actual immersion. See *Cat.* iii. 4, quoted below.

[2] *Procat.* § 2.

[3] *Ibid.* § 4.

therefore get ready and prepare. . . . Do not attend to the laver as mere water, but to the spiritual grace given along with the water.[1] For as the things offered upon the Gentile altars, being naturally their mere selves, become defiled by the invocation of the idols, so, by contrary, the mere water, receiving the invocation of the Holy Ghost, and of Christ, and of the Father, acquires a power of sanctity. For since man is a twofold being, composed of soul and body, the cleansing element also is twofold, the incorporeal for the incorporeal, the bodily for the body. And the water cleanses the body, but the Spirit seals the soul, in order that having our hearts sprinkled by the Spirit, and our bodies washed with pure water, we may draw nigh to God. When, therefore, you are about to go down into the water, do not pay attention to the mere nature of the water, but expect salvation by the operation of the Holy Ghost. For without both it is impossible for thee to be perfected. It is not I that say this, but the Lord Jesus Christ, who has the matter in His own power. He says, 'Except a man be born from above,' and adds, 'of water and Spirit, he cannot enter into the kingdom of God.' On the one hand, he who is being baptized (*βαπτιζόμενος*) with the water, but has not had the Spirit vouchsafed to him (*καταξιωθείς*), has not the grace in perfection: on the other hand, even if a man be distinguished for virtue in his deeds, but does not receive the seal bestowed by means of water (*τὴν δι'*

[1] *Τῇ μετὰ τοῦ ὕδατος διδομένῃ πνευματικῇ χάριτι.* Touttée's text has *δεδομένῃ*, without remark; it must be a mistake for *διδομένῃ*.

ὕδατος σφραγῖδα), he shall not enter into the kingdom of heaven. This is a venturesome saying, but it is not mine: it is Jesus who declared it. Take the proof of my words from the Divine Scripture. Cornelius was a just man, to whom angelic appearances were vouchsafed, who had reared an excellent monument in heaven with God by his prayers and alms. Peter came, and the Spirit was poured upon those who believed, and they spake with tongues, and prophesied. And after the grace of the Spirit, the Scripture says that Peter ordered them to be baptized in the name of Jesus Christ,—in order that the soul having been regenerated through faith, the body also might partake, through the water, of the grace."[1]

Here "the spiritual grace given along with the water" appears to be identified with the gift of the Spirit as poured out (for instance) upon Cornelius. It not only appears to be "given along with the water," but even in a kind of way to be sacramentally united with the water—a "power of sanctity" acquired by the water when consecrated. The position is the same which we have observed in the Alexandrians, Didymus and Cyril. And yet it would be left doubtful, even if this were the only passage to guide us in Cyril of Jerusalem, whether he thought that "the grace given along with the water" was actually the *res sacramenti*, so that the baptismal water conveys it just in the same sense as the Eucharist conveys the Body of Christ. The words "given along with the water" may even themselves

[1] *Cat.* iii. 3, 4.

suggest a different interpretation;—especially when taken in conjunction with the words, "He who is in course of being baptized with the water, but has not yet had the Spirit vouchsafed to him, has not the grace in perfection." These words seem to point to the history of the Samaritan baptisms, and recall Origen's description of the men as still βαπτιζόμενοι, "in process of baptism," between the first baptismal act and the second. With this agree also other passing expressions of Cyril; as when he says that the catechumen is to believe in the Holy Ghost "who now also seals thy soul during the time of Baptism" (κατὰ τὸν καιρὸν τοῦ βαπτίσματος),[1] or, more generally, speaking of the descent upon Christ, says that it took place "at the time of the Baptism (ἐν τῷ καιρῷ)."[2]

It is fortunate, however, that in the case of Cyril of Jerusalem, we have explicit teaching to enforce what might otherwise, perhaps, appear to be wrung by violence out of such expressions. Speaking of the way in which the Holy Spirit had come upon men under the Old Dispensation, he says:—

"He came down upon many before. It is written that 'Joshua the son of Nun was filled with the Spirit of wisdom, for Moses had laid his hands upon him.' You see everywhere the figure (τύπον), in the Old Testament and in the New the same. In Moses' time the Spirit was given through laying on of hands;

[1] *Cat.* iv. 16.

[2] *Cat.* xvii. 10. Compare the paragraph before (xvii. 9) where τὸ ἅγιον πνεῦμα τῶν βαπτιζομένων suggests that the order of Christ's Baptism is the order of ours.

and Peter gives the Spirit through laying on of hands; and upon you also, who are undergoing Baptism (τὸν βαπτιζόμενον), the grace is about to come, though I do not tell you how (τὸ δὲ πῶς οὐ λέγω), for I do not forestall the time."[1]

That the Spirit was to come upon them in the course of their Baptism is here again clearly stated; but that Cyril did not intend them to suppose that Baptism itself would convey the gift is equally clear. Again and again in earlier lectures, as well as in the words actually before us, Cyril has taught them to expect the gift in Baptism; if, therefore, the immersion itself were to be the means of receiving it, he has already told them his secret. Yet now he says that he will not tell them "how" they are to receive it. That remains for a future occasion. Meanwhile, he speaks of a different "figure," used both in the Old Testament and in the New, as the means of conveying the gift, and intimates that that figure, or at least one that answers to it, will be used for the same purpose in the Baptism for which his candidates are preparing.[2]

The matter is freed from ambiguity when we turn to Cyril's "Mystagogical Lectures,"—the discourses delivered (like S. Ambrose's *De Mysteriis*) after the initiation was completed, to explain the rites which

[1] *Cat.* xvi. 26.

[2] Probably Cyril was a little hindered at the moment by feeling that the rite which his bishop was about to use would scarcely be called a "laying on of hands" as its natural designation. At the same time his language unhesitatingly identifies the apostolic rite with the anointing of which he has to speak later.

had been undergone. He reminds the neophytes of their renunciations and professions, of their stripping, and their preliminary unction from head to foot with exorcized oil. Of this preliminary unction he speaks in terms not unlike some of those in the *Apostolical Constitutions*, though less extravagant. It made them "partakers of the good olive-tree, Jesus Christ;" it was "calculated to banish every trace of the adversary's working;" it was able "not only to cleanse away by burning the traces of actual sins, but also to chase out all the powers invisible of the Evil One."[1] Cyril seems to regard it as truly sacramental, not symbolical only. Then came the triple confession, and the triple immersion, which represented the three days' burial of Christ, bringing with it remission of sins and the grace of adoption.[2] Of the receiving of the Spirit thus far in Baptism S. Cyril gives no hint. But after this follows, what is unique among the early Greek theologians, a whole discourse upon the Unction which we call Confirmation. The time was come when Cyril could freely tell his catechumens "how" the Holy Ghost is received.

"Being now baptized into Christ," he begins, "and having put on Christ, you have become conformed to the Son of God. For God, having predestinated us to adoption, made us conformed to Christ's body of glory. Having therefore become partakers of Christ,

[1] *Cat. Myst.* ii. 3.

[2] Unless Touttée is right in saying that adoption, for Cyril, is always synonymous with the gift of the Spirit,—in which case here as elsewhere he is speaking of Baptism in the larger sense when he makes adoption a part of the benefits of it.

you are reasonably called 'christs,' and concerning you God said, 'Touch not My christs.' Now you have become christs by receiving the figure of the Holy Ghost (*χριστοὶ δὲ γεγόνατε τοῦ ἁγίου πνεύματος τὸ ἀντίτυπον δεξάμενοι*). And all things have been done upon you in a representative way (*εἰκονικῶς*), because you are representations (*εἰκόνες*, images) of Christ. And He, indeed, having washed in the river Jordan, and having imparted of the odour of His Godhead to the waters, went up out of them, and there came to Him a visitation of the Holy Ghost in the fulness of His being (*οὐσιώδης ἐπιφοίτησις*), like resting upon like. And to you also, when you had come up (*ἀναβεβηκόσιν*) from the pool of the sacred font, was given an unction, the figure (*ἀντίτυπον*) of that with which Christ was anointed; and that is the Holy Ghost. . . . For Christ was not anointed by men with material oil or unguent, but the Father, having destined Him to be the Saviour of the whole world, anointed Him with the Holy Ghost. . . . And just as Christ had been truly crucified, and was buried, and rose again, while you in your Baptism were allowed to be crucified and buried and raised up again with Him in a similitude, so is it also with the Chrism. He was anointed with an invisible oil of gladness, that is, with the Holy Ghost, who is called oil of gladness because He is the cause of spiritual gladness; you were anointed with unguent, being made partakers and fellows of Christ."[1]

Cyril then proceeds to speak of the sacramental

[1] *Cat. Myst.* iii. 1, 2.

chrism in the same way as he has spoken of the sacramental water:—

"But see that you do not imagine that unguent to be mere unguent. For as the bread of the Eucharist, after the invocation of the Holy Ghost, is no longer mere bread, but Christ's Body, so also this holy unguent is no longer mere unguent, or, as one might say, common unguent, after the invocation, but is Christ's gracious gift, and is made effectual to convey the Holy Ghost, by the presence of His own Godhead (*πνεύματος ἁγίου παρουσίᾳ τῆς αὐτοῦ θεότητος ἐνεργητικόν*). And this unguent is symbolically applied to your forehead and your other organs of sense, and your body is anointed with the tangible oil, and your soul is sanctified by the holy and lifegiving Spirit."[1]

He then gives reasons for the application of the chrism to brow, ears, nostrils, and breast, upon which last it is a breastplate, and adds:

"For even as Christ, after His Baptism and the visitation of the Holy Ghost, went forth and subdued the adversary, so you also, after the sacred Baptism and the mystical Chrism, being clothed in the whole armour of the Holy Ghost, must stand against the power of the adversary and subdue it, saying, 'I can do all things in Christ who strengtheneth me.' When this holy Chrism has been vouchsafed to you, you are called Christians, approving by your regeneration the truth of the name;—for before this grace was vouchsafed to you, you did not properly deserve this

[1] *Cat. Myst.* iii. 3.

appellation, but were journeying and advancing towards being Christians."[1]

In the Old Testament dispensation, the type and symbol of this Unction was used to make men priests and kings :—

"When Moses imparted the injunction of God to his brother, making him high priest, after he had washed in water, Moses anointed him, and he was called an 'Anointed' (χριστός) from the figurative unction. So also the high priest, advancing Solomon to be king, anointed him, after he had washed in the Gihon. But these things happened to them figuratively, while to you they happen not figuratively, because you were anointed with (ἀπό) the Holy Ghost indeed."[2]

Cyril concludes with an exhortation to prize what has thus been received :—

"Guard it undefiled, for it will teach you all things, if it abide in you. . . . For this holy thing is a spiritual safeguard of the body and salvation of the soul. Of this the blessed Esaias spoke in prophecy long ago, 'And the Lord shall make (a feast) to all nations in this mountain, . . . they shall drink wine, they shall be anointed with ointment, . . . deliver all these things to the nations.' . . . Having therefore been anointed with this holy ointment, keep it undefiled and unblameable in yourselves, making progress by good works, and being well pleasing to the Captain of your salvation, Christ Jesus."[3]

[1] *Cat. Myst.* iii. 4, 5. [2] *Ibid.* 6.
[3] *Ibid.* 7. Compare his interpretation of Ps. xxiii. in *Cat. Myst.*

Perhaps some of the sentences quoted from this Lecture, taken by themselves, might have given the impression that S. Cyril thought of the Unction as only symbolical. If so, they are abundantly corrected by others. In contrast with the way in which Christ was anointed, ours is said to be a "representation," a "figure." But this is only because His Unction was without any sacramental sign, while ours is sacramental. This is plainly shown by the second contrast, between our Unction and that of the Old Testament priests and kings. They had but the symbol; we have both the symbol and the thing symbolized.

Thus Confirmation—that is, the Unction which Cyril identifies with the apostolic Imposition of Hands—is for him a part of Baptism, but it is that part in which the main value of Baptism resides. It is no mere accessory of Baptism; it has a substantive value, and ranks side by side with Baptism. "After the sacred Baptism and the mystical Chrism" we are "clothed in the panoply of the Holy Ghost." It is the "figure (*ἀντίτυπον*) of the Holy Ghost." Cyril's use of the word *ἀντίτυπον* elsewhere plainly shows that he does not mean by it a figure which is only a figure, but rather what is called an "effectual sign." This he states in so many words concerning the unguent after invocation: it is "effectual to convey

iv. 7. Nothing could be more admirable than Touttée's notes upon the relation of Confirmation to Baptism as taught by Cyril of Jerusalem: see especially the Third Dissertation prefixed to his edition, pp. clxxxix. foll. He gives the key to what is said by many other Fathers besides Cyril.

the Holy Ghost." We thereby, after "having come up from the pool of the sacred font," receive, in a way suited to our needs, what Christ received after His Baptism,—"a visitation of the Holy Ghost in the fulness of His being." These are things which Cyril never says of Baptism when left uncompleted. The benefits of the sacrament are, in his estimation, to be conformed to Christ, to be made His fellows, truly "Christians," priests, and kings; to be sanctified in soul, enabled to stand against the adversary and subdue him; to be taught all things, and spiritually safeguarded.

How full was S. Cyril's conception of this great gift may be gathered from the passages where he compares it with the partial gifts bestowed under the Old Testament, and on the evening of the Resurrection.

"Having often worked in prophets, He now (on the day of Pentecost) exhibited a new and wonderful thing. The grace did, indeed, come upon the fathers also; but here more exceedingly. There, they partook of Holy Spirit; but here they were absolutely (*αὐτοτελῶς*) baptized."[1]

"A fellowship of this Holy Spirit He bestowed upon the Apostles; for it is written, 'And having said this, He breathed on them, and said, Whosesoever sins ye remit, they are remitted unto them; and whosesoever sins ye retain, they are retained.' This was a second breathing; for the first was impaired through wilful sins. . . . But now while He gives

[1] *Cat.* xvii. 18.

the grace, He lavishes it more largely and says, 'I am ready to give even now; but the vessel cannot as yet contain it: receive now as much of the grace as you can contain, but expect yet more; tarry ye in the city of Jerusalem, till ye be endued with power from on high; now receive the gift in part (μερικῶς), then you shall wear it absolutely (αὐτοτελῶς).' Oftentimes one who receives, has the thing given but in part, but one who is endued is compassed all round about by the garment. . . . The grace was not in part (on the day of Pentecost); the power was absolute. As one who plunges in the waters and is baptized is on all sides surrounded by the waters, so they also were baptized by the Spirit entirely (ὁλοτελῶς). Only, while water is circumfused externally, the Spirit baptizes also the soul internally without leaving any part untouched (ἀπαραλείπτως)."[1]

It is this latter, Pentecostal outpouring, which is bestowed upon the Christian:—

"The Apostles partook of fire,—not fire which burns up, but fire which brings salvation, destroying the thorns of sin, but making the soul bright. This it is which is now about to come upon you also."[2]

The Church of Palestine has a later representative, within the same century as Cyril, in Epiphanius, Bishop of Salamis in Cyprus, but a native of the Holy Land and always in close relations with it. S. Epiphanius appears to have felt a special shrinking from writing down any account of the baptismal rites, even where it might have been natural for him

[1] *Cat.* xvii. 12, 13. [2] *Ibid.* 15.

to do so, contenting himself with saying that "the other mysteries, concerning Baptism and the mysteries within," are accomplished according to tradition.[1] But in one place he argues that it is not bread, nor water, but a power in and beyond the elements, which does the believing recipient good:—

"Not that the water alone should cleanse us, but that in the force attached to the water (ἐν τῇ ἰσχύι τοῦ ὕδατος), by means of faith, and (Divine) activity, and hope, and mysteries of perfecting (μυστηρίων τελειώσεως), and naming of the (Divine) Sanctity, it might be to us for a perfecting of salvation."[2]

No doubt Confirmation is at least included in the "mysteries of perfecting," without which the baptismal water is thought by Epiphanius to be inoperative.

I now turn to the illustrious band of fourth-century scholars and theologians who gathered round the see which a hundred years or so earlier had been held by S. Firmilian, that of Caesarea in Cappadocia.

S. Basil, the leader of this band, knew the Catechetical Lectures of S. Cyril. In one place he gives, with some additions, S. Cyril's rehearsal of the praises of Baptism which I have quoted above.[3] There is no reason to suppose that he disapproved of any part of the baptismal doctrine contained in them. But

[1] *Adv. Haer.* III. ii. 22.

[2] *Recapit.* p. 881 (Migne). The words "the force attached to the water" are taken out of an "expression in the Prophet" just before quoted. I do not know where the quotation comes from.

[3] *Hom. in Sanct. Bapt.* § 5 (vol. ii. p. 117 D Garnier). See above, p. 336.

S. Basil nowhere, that I know of, speaks very definitely of the different parts of Baptism. He treats it as a whole, both as regards the ritual of the sacrament, and as regards the spiritual contents.

Thus, Baptism is the seal. How, S. Basil asks, can a man expect to get back to Paradise, "if he be not sealed by Baptism"?[1] The Ethiopian eunuch, when he believed, made no delay to receive "the seal of the Spirit."[2]

"No one will know you whether you are ours or our adversaries', unless you shew us that you belong to us by the mystical tokens, unless the light of the Lord's countenance be signed upon you.[3] How shall the angel take your part, how deliver you from the enemies, if he does not recognise the seal? How will you say, 'I am God's,' if you do not bear upon you the indications? Do you not know that it was the marked (sealed) houses which the destroyer passed over, while he slew the firstborn in the unmarked? Unmarked treasure is easily laid hold of by thieves; a sheep without a sign is an object for designs that involve no risk to the designer."[4]

Those who heard this appeal might perhaps have said with certainty that S. Basil meant, or did not mean, by the seal, the Unction which followed Baptism. For us the matter is somewhat complicated by knowing that the actual Baptism is sometimes, though much less frequently, spoken of as a seal; but at least there can be no doubt that the Baptism to

[1] *Hom. in Sanct. Bapt.* p. 115 C.
[2] p. 119 C.
[3] The LXX. version of Psalm iv. 7.
[4] p. 117 B.

which S. Basil invited his audience was one which included the confirmatory Unction, and the entire transaction was so completely a single whole in his view that there need be no hesitation in supposing that he would have regarded the house as still unmarked and the sheep as still without its sign, if the baptized should stop willingly short of the completing rite.

And, as with the seal, so with the inner gifts of Baptism. S. Basil seems to make them all depend upon the impartition of the Holy Ghost. Without this, he shews, like Athanasius and others, that we cannot be children of God, nor attain His likeness, nor in fact remain in life itself.

"The creature," he argues against Eunomius, "is not so unhappy, nor God so powerless, as not to diffuse the sacred impartition upon the things which He has made. Assuredly it has been His will to make man immediately after His own image. . . . But if it is not possible for human beings to fashion materials after a given likeness without those materials receiving something of the ideas on which they are made, how could the creature rise into likeness to God if it does not receive something of the Divine impress (*χαρακτῆρος*)? But the Divine impress is not like the human, but is a living impress, and an image which verily forms other images (*εἰκὼν εἰκονοποιός*), so that all things which partake of it are made images of God. The image of God is Christ, . . . and the image of the Son is the Spirit, and those who partake of this Spirit are sons conformed to His likeness,

according to the saying of Scripture . . . And He is an image indeed,—not, as we are, the issue of an image. This is the reason why He impresses the image, and is not impressed with it; and the Unction is not itself anointed. And the Spirit is an unction upon us, as John says. And why should I say 'upon us?' for before us it was also in the Lord Himself according to the flesh: 'Jesus of Nazareth,' it says, 'how God anointed Him with the Holy Ghost and power.' He is 'Christ,' then, because of the Spirit and the anointing in the Spirit. Assuredly the Lord's anointing did not come through anything foreign to the Godhead, nor His name of Christ, nor those who from Him are called Christians. We might well lament if the very name of our salvation were to begin from a creature, and be derived from a creature,—if we were to have our adoption through a servant. Creature does not sanctify creature, but all things are sanctified by the one Holy One who says, 'For their sakes I sanctify Myself,' and He sanctifies through the Spirit. The Spirit then is not a creature, but the impress of the holiness of God, and the source of sanctification to all things. We were called, as the Apostle teaches, 'in sanctification of the Spirit.' This Spirit renews us, and exhibits us as images of God once more; through the laver of regeneration and renewing of the Holy Ghost we are adopted as sons to God. It is a new creature once more by partaking of the Spirit, by the loss of whom it had been made old."[1]

[1] *Adv. Eunom.* V. (vol. i. pp. 301–303).

But little heed is here paid to diversities in the mode of the Spirit's action. To be anointed with the Spirit, to partake of the Spirit,—to be adopted as sons, new created, renewed, through the Spirit,—to receive the Divine impress, to be images of God once more, to be sanctified, through the Spirit,—all seem to be treated as much the same thing. S. Basil does not seem to care to distinguish between movements so closely resembling each other, and all connected with the grace of Baptism. There is, however, one passage where even S. Basil seems to treat the baptismal washing as a preparation for a greater gift to follow it.

"'The Lord shall make the flood an habitation (*κατοικιεῖ*)'. A flood is an inundation of water making all that is under it to disappear and cleansing all that before had been defiled. Therefore he calls the grace of Baptism a flood, so that the soul which has washed off its sins, and has cleansed away the old man, is fit thereafter for an habitation of God in the Spirit. . . . 'And the Lord shall sit a king for ever.' In the soul which shines bright from the flood God establishes Himself and makes it as it were a throne for Himself."[1]

[1] *Hom. in Psalm.* xxviii. (vol. i. p. 123). Whoever was the author of the "silly" oration on this Psalm appended to S. Basil (vol. i. p. 358; see note *a* on that page), gives a slightly different turn by making the entrance of God into the soul take place during the process of washing. "Through Baptism is God's taking up His abode in the souls of them that have been sanctified (*τῶν ἡγιασμένων*). The soul which is washing away (*ἀπολουομένην*) its sin, God inhabits." Even here, however, the word *ἡγιασμένων* indicates that the purification takes place first and the entrance follows, so that *ἀπολουομένην* is

Such language, of course, need not imply that a second sacramental action was necessary to effect the lodgement of the Divine Spirit in the soul; but it at any rate implies that the cleansing which Baptism represents is effected first, and then the lodgement, and that the lodgement is not the means of the cleansing.

That Basil was neither ignorant of Confirmation, nor regarded it as unimportant, is of course unnecessary to state. He bears his express testimony to the universal custom and belief in the famous passage where he insists upon the importance of observing many things which are not commanded in Scripture. After speaking of the Invocation at the consecration of the Eucharist, as "having great efficacy" in the ministration of that sacrament, he proceeds:—

"Again, we bless both the water of Baptism and the oil of Unction, and the man receiving Baptism as well. From what Scripture words does the custom come? Is it not from the tacit and mystical tradition? And what of the unction with the oil at all? What written word prescribed it? And that the man is baptized three times, whence comes it,—and all the other things connected with Baptism?"[1]

It might, perhaps, be fairly argued from these words, if they stood alone, that S. Basil regarded the unction as an accessory and significant rite in Baptism, but not as strictly sacramental. In that

probably to be understood to refer to the whole course of the baptismal service.

[1] *De Spir. Sto.* § 27 (vol. iii. p. 55).

case S. Basil would not have been in agreement with the general tradition of the Church, the authority of which tradition he is upholding.

It remains to be said that Basil was well acquainted with the correspondence between "the great Denys" and the Roman see, and between Cyprian "and our own Firmilian" on heretical baptisms. Theoretically he was inclined to agree with S. Firmilian, though practically he followed a different ruling in the case of schismatics who were not heretics. The ground, he says, in writing to S. Amphilochius, upon which the party of Cyprian went was that

"Those who withdrew from the Church no longer had the grace of the Holy Spirit upon them. The impartition failed, by the interruption of the continuity. For those who first seceded had their ordinations (*χειροτονίας*) from the fathers, and through the laying on of their hands they had the spiritual gift; but those who were cut off, becoming laymen, had no authority either to baptize or to ordain (*χειροτονεῖν*), no longer being able to bestow on others the grace of the Holy Spirit which they themselves had lost. And so (Cyprian and Firmilian) urged that those who came over to the Church from them, as having a lay baptism, should be cleansed by the true Baptism of the Church. But since it has been agreed, I know, by some in Asia, out of consideration for the circumstances of so many (*οἰκονομίας ἕνεκα τῶν πολλῶν*), that their Baptism should be accepted, let it be accepted. . . . But on all accounts let it be laid down, that those who come to us from that Baptism

of theirs should be anointed, among the faithful I mean, and so approach the mysteries."[1]

There can be no doubt that the Imposition of Hands of which S. Basil here speaks as conveying, and empowering others to convey, the spiritual gift, is that of Ordination, not of Confirmation, and that here, as elsewhere, he treats Baptism as completely one thing, in which, he implies, as in Ordination, the grace of the Holy Spirit is given. But his willingness to surrender the rebaptism of schismatics and heretics, while strongly insisting upon their being anointed, indicates that he, like most of the Fathers, felt that the chief incidence of baptismal grace is not upon the first part of the sacrament.[2]

It is in accordance with this feeling that S. Basil instinctively speaks of Baptism under the title of the Seal when he traces to it the abiding gift of the Spirit. It would be unsafe to affirm positively that by the Seal he meant Confirmation as distinct from Baptism; but few will question that it is especially in view of the later acts in Baptism that he explains the "cutting asunder" of the wicked servant to be

"The soul's perpetual alienation from the Spirit. For now although He is not found to have been united or blended (ἀνακέκραται) with the unworthy,

[1] *Epist.* clxxxviii. [*Canonica* i.] (vol. iii. p. 270).

[2] The author of the two books on Baptism printed in the appendix to S. Basil's works—said by some to have been Eustathius of Sebastia—makes no mention of Confirmation in any form; nor of the Spirit as given in Baptism either. It is the more curious, inasmuch as he devotes a large portion of his treatise to the Holy Communion which the newly baptized received. Striking evidence is thus borne to the absolute oneness of the baptismal sacrament.

nevertheless He seems in a way to be present with those who have once been sealed, awaiting their conversion and consequent salvation; but then He will be wholly severed from the soul which has profaned His grace."[1]

S. Basil's younger brother,—or son, as he loved to call himself,—S. Gregory of Nyssa, evinces the same strong sense of the oneness of Baptism which we find in S. Basil. Even the remission of sins (which, for the moment at least, S. Gregory treats as the equivalent of regeneration) appears to be traced to the reception of the Holy Ghost.

"This benefit is not conferred by the water,—it would be too lofty for any creature,—but by God's commandment and by the visitation of the Spirit, coming mystically to set us at liberty. The water serves in a subordinate manner (ὑπηρετεῖ) to declare our cleansing."

Gregory then goes on, after the manner of Cyril, to explain how the outward water and the Spirit invisible correspond to the compound nature of man. The Spirit, "being called by faith, and coming in an inexplicable manner . . . blesses the body which is baptized and the water which baptizes. Therefore do not despise the Divine laver, nor think lightly of it as if it were a common thing because of the use of water there; for that which works the effect is great, and from it the things accomplished are wonderful." The altar, he argues, at which he stands, is no longer a common slab. "The bread, again, is up to a

[1] *De Spir. Sto.* § 16 (vol. iii. p. 34).

certain moment common bread, but when the mystery does its sacred work upon it, it is called, and becomes, Christ's Body. So the mystic oil, so the wine, are things of little worth before the blessing; but after the sanctification of the Spirit, both the one and the other have a different potency." So it is with the baptismal water. Elias' sacrifice foreshadows the mystery of Baptism. "The fire was lighted by water thrice poured on, so that it was shewn that where the mystical water is, there is the kindling Spirit, warm and fire-like, burning up the ungodly and enlightening the faithful."[1]

In his great catechetical instruction, given before Baptism, S. Gregory of Nyssa gives no account of the employment of that "mystic oil" which he mentions above. He dwells again upon the contrast of the outward and inward. He says that if the baptized does not alter his life, then, "bold though it be to say it, yet I will say it and not shrink from it; in their case the water will be water, and the gift of the Holy Ghost will be displayed in no part of the proceeding (*οὐδαμοῦ ἐπιφανείσης τῷ γινομένῳ*)."[2] He lays great stress upon the invocation. "It is prayer to God, and the invocation of heavenly grace, and water, and faith, through which the mystery of regeneration is accomplished."[3] He says nothing here about the Chrism. Baptism is one sacrament, and one effect.

Yet perhaps it is not overstraining a point when we note that Gregory, in his appeal to those who put

[1] *In Bapt. Christi* (vol. iii. p. 376, Moreau).
[2] *Catech. Orat.* § 40 (vol. iii. p. 108).
[3] *Ibid.* § 33 (p. 95).

off Baptism, seems distinctly to suggest, as S. Basil does, that the cleansing, in that sacrament, though effected by the presence and power of the Spirit, is a thing which precedes the illapse of the Spirit.

"Let go the greedy raven of thy life. Give the Dove an opportunity to fly to thee. That Dove Jesus first in a figure drew down out of heaven, the guileless, the most gentle, the prolific dove, which, when it finds a man cleansed (κεκαθαρμένον), like well-worked silver, enters and nestles in him (εἰσοικίζεται), and brooding warms the soul, and hatches many a gracious young one of its own."[1]

Our subject does not gain much more help from the friend of the two brothers, Gregory's namesake, Bishop of Nazianzus, who shares with S. John the title of "the Divine." To him, as to the brothers, Baptism is one sacrament and one effect. But how prominent in his estimation the second part of it was, and how essentially one with the earlier part, is incidentally shewn where he is describing the baptism of his father by the hands of his father's predecessor in the see of Nazianzus. A glory, he says, was seen about him,

"So evident and noticeable to the man who was baptizing and initiating (or perfecting) him (τῷ βαπτιστῇ καὶ τελειωτῇ), that he was unable to keep the mystery to himself, but raised his voice and said publicly, that he was anointing with the Spirit his own successor."[2]

[1] *De Bapt.* (vol. ii. p. 218). The raven and the dove are, of course, a reference to the history of Noah.

[2] *Orat.* xix. (vol. i. p. 295, Morcau).

S. Gregory the Divine gives a list of titles for Holy Baptism, probably imitated from S. Clement of Alexandria, in which he treats the sacrament as if it might be called indifferently after either of its two parts:—

"We call it gift, bounty (χάρισμα), Baptism, Chrism, enlightenment, robe of incorruption, laver of regeneration, seal, everything that is precious;—gift, because it is given to those who have brought nothing for it; bounty, because given to those who are actually in debt; Baptism, because sin is buried with them in the water; Chrism, as being sacred and royal, for such were the things that were anointed; enlightenment, as being a brightness; robe, as a covering of shame; laver, as a washing clean; seal, as a preservative and the mark of ownership."[1]

But if here he does not help us to any precise notion of the value which he attached to the Seal or the Chrism, a little later in the same oration the matter becomes clearer:—

"But if you prepossess yourself with the Seal, and fortify yourself for the time to come with the best of succours and the strongest, being marked both in soul and in body with the Chrism and with the Spirit, . . . what harm can befall you?"[2]

Here the gift of the Spirit appears to be markedly associated with the Chrism,—in a sermon, be it observed, on Baptism; and in another sermon, extant only in a Latin translation by Rufinus, Gregory as markedly dissociates the gift from Baptism itself:—

"He led the people of Israel, like a guide for their

[1] *Orat.* xl. p. 638. [2] p. 646.

journey, in a pillar of cloud by day, and by night in a pillar of fire, to shew forth the grace of Baptism by the cloud, and the gift of the Holy Ghost by the fire; wherefore the Apostle Paul writes that the fathers were baptized in the cloud, and the Acts of the Apostles declare that the Spirit is like fire."[1]

S. Gregory's comment would have been still more effective if, like another whom we shall examine, he had made the sea the type of Baptism, and the cloud, whether of fire or not, the type of the Gift; but he would hardly have made it plainer that he discerned two movements of grace, one given by Baptism itself, and one not;—the latter (the gift of the Holy Ghost), as we may infer from his language previously quoted, given by the Chrism.

But perhaps the words for which the student of this subject has reason to be most grateful to S. Gregory the Divine are those in which, apart from the question of Baptism, he traces the *profectus apostolicus*,—the advance of the Apostles,—with a firmness which S. Jerome (for a short time Gregory's secretary at Constantinople) would have done well to imitate more closely than he did. In a noble Pentecostal sermon, he teaches that the Holy Spirit worked first in the angelical beings; then in the patriarchs and prophets;—

"Then in the disciples of Christ—for I forbear to speak of Christ Himself, with whom He was present not as working in Him, but as accompanying One who was His equal in honour—and in these in

[1] *Orat.* lix. (p. 735).

a threefold manner, according as they were capable of containing Him, and at three different times,—before Christ was glorified by His passion; after He was glorified by the resurrection; after His ascension, or restoration, to heaven, or whatever we ought to call it. The Holy Ghost is shewn by the earliest cleansing from diseases and from evil spirits, which assuredly did not take place without the Spirit;—and by the breathing after the accommodation to our conditions was ended, which evidently was a more Divine inspiration;—and by this present dividing of the fiery tongues, which we celebrate to-day. But the first time He was shewn dimly; the second time more expressly; to-day more perfectly, no longer being present with the disciples by His working, as before, but coming to be with them and share their social life, as one might say, in the fulness of His being."[1]

S. Gregory sketches the same advance more rapidly in another discourse; where he shews the gradual progress of revelation, by which we are led "from strength to strength":—

"This is, I suppose, the reason why the Spirit sojourns with the disciples by degrees, dealing out proportionably to the capacity of the recipients,—in the beginning of the gospel, after the Passion, after the going up;—performing the miracles, breathed forth, appearing in fiery tongues."[2]

[1] *Orat.* xliv. (vol. i. p. 712, 713), *οὐκ ἔτι ἐνεργείᾳ παρὸν ὡς πρότερον, οὐσιωδῶς δέ, ὡς ἂν εἴποι τις, συγγινόμενόν τε καὶ συμπολιτευόμενον.*

[2] *Orat.* xxxvii. (vol. i. p. 608). This is perhaps as good a place as

In this way we learn from S. Gregory to understand the various stages by which the Holy Spirit approaches that relationship to the Christian soul which it is His will to occupy,—the earlier drawings of grace, the baptismal quickening, and then the entrance "in the fulness of His being" by the act which completes our Baptism.

The next group of authors to be examined are the learned leaders of the school of Antioch, of whom the chief is S. Chrysostom.

S. Chrysostom dwells frequently upon the gift of the Holy Ghost as conveyed in Baptism.

Thus, for example, the descent of the Dove upon Christ at His Baptism was in order to indicate Him as the Son of God;

"And not for this cause only, but in order that

any to mention the so-called Seventh Canon of the œcumenical Council of Constantinople (A.D. 381), in which Council Gregory took part. That Canon gives directions concerning the reception of heretics, certain of whom are "first sealed or anointed with the holy unguent on the forehead, eyes, nostrils, mouth, and ears; and in sealing them to say, 'The seal of the gift of the Holy Ghost.'" Dr. Bright (*Notes on Canons of First Four Councils* p. 104) shews that the Canon is spurious; and Mr. Gwatkin points out to me that the date of Sabbatius (whose followers are mentioned in the Canon) is not earlier than 389, a fact which Dr. Bright omits to mention. Prof. Gwatkin, however, observes (*Studies of Arianism* p. 131, note) that the Canon is not so much as a century later than its professed date. The Council of Laodicea, the date of which is uncertain, but which probably belongs to about the year 365 (Westcott *Canon of the New Testament* p. 428), not only gave similar directions concerning the admission of heretics, but found it necessary for some reason to lay down in general, "that those who are being enlightened must after the Baptism be anointed with heavenly Chrism and be partakers of the Kingdom of the Christ" (Canon 48). The doctrine is not very full; but Chrism is regarded as an integral part of the baptismal "enlightenment."

thou also mightest learn that the Spirit cometh upon thee also in thy Baptism (*βαπτιζόμενον*)." [1]

Again, though miracles have ceased in the Church,

"We have the chief of good things in Baptism; we received remission of sins, sanctification, participation of the Spirit, adoption, eternal life." [2]

And again,

"For thou also didst enjoy divine grace in thy Baptism (*βαπτιζόμενος*), and didst partake of the Spirit, if not indeed to work miracles, yet as much as suffices for making the life upright and exact; so that it is of our own negligence if we are perverted." [3]

Like some others, S. Chrysostom seems to make the receiving of the Holy Ghost the inward part of Baptism corresponding to the outward sacrament of the water. Thus, speaking of our Lord's promise, "Ye shall be baptized with the Holy Ghost not many days hence," he says:—

"How does He say, 'Ye shall be baptized,' when there was no water in the Upper Chamber? Because the more important thing is the Spirit, through whom alone it is that the water is effectual. In the same way, He is Himself said to have been anointed, though He received the Spirit without ever being anointed with oil. Or to take another view, they are to be found also receiving a baptism of water, and that on different occasions. In our time both things take place at once (*ἀμφότερα γίνεται ὑφ' ἕν*); but then separately (*διεσπασμένως*)." [4]

[1] *Hom. in Matt.* xii. p. 163 D.
[2] *Hom. in Act.* xl. p. 285 (Migne.)
[3] *De Compunct. ad Demetr.* i. 8.
[4] *Hom. in Act.* i. § 5.

Yet in spite of this language, which emphasizes the oneness of Baptism, Chrysostom was not less fully aware than others, that there was a special point in the baptismal service at which this gift of the Holy Ghost was given, and that it was not the moment of immersion. Commenting upon S. Paul's words, "and were all made to drink into one Spirit," he says, with great justice;—

"My own opinion is, that he is now speaking of that coming (ἐπιφοίτησιν) of the Spirit, which takes place in us directly after Baptism (ἀπὸ τοῦ βαπτίσματος) and before the Mysteries."[1]

There can, of course, be no question that he refers to the moment of Unction or Confirmation.

Perhaps it is a little disappointing, however, after this clear and precise language, to find the great preacher elsewhere using expressions which would appear to minimise the gift received in Confirmation in a way which controversialists like Daillé have not been slow to lay hold of. Chrysostom sometimes speaks as if he held, like a modern Protestant, that the apostolic Imposition of Hands only conveyed certain miraculous powers. Not content with the simple statement of the inspired historian, that the Samaritan believers, having gone no further than Baptism, had not yet received the illapse of the Spirit, he says:

"How then did they not receive the Spirit [at their Baptism]? They received the Spirit of remission, but they had not as yet received the Spirit of miracles.

[1] *Hom. in* 1 *Cor.* xxx. p. 271 A.

And that this is the explanation, that they had not received the Spirit of miracles, look how Simon,—on seeing [what followed the Laying on of Hands], came and asked [for power to confer the like gift]."

Chrysostom then proceeds to discuss the question why this gift of the "Spirit of Miracles" had not been bestowed in the Baptism of the Samaritans:—

"And why had they not received the Holy Ghost [in this sense] on being baptized? Either because [their baptizer] would not confer it, Philip in this perhaps honouring the Apostles: or because he did not possess this gracious privilege (*χάρισμα*), for he was one of the Seven. This is the more probable suggestion. So in my opinion this Philip was one of the Seven, the next after Stephen, and for this reason, in baptizing, never attempted to give the Spirit to those whom he was baptizing (*βαπτίζων πνεῦμα τοῖς βαπτιζομένοις οὐκ ἐδίδου*), because he had not the right to do so, for this gift (*δῶρον*) belonged only to the Twelve. And observe,—the Twelve were not in the habit of travelling abroad (*οὐκ ἐξήεσαν*, were at this time stationary in Jerusalem); it was the Divine plan that the Seven should go forth, who did not enjoy this grace, because they had not yet received the Holy Ghost. For they had received the power to work miracles, but not the power to give the Spirit to others. This, plainly, was a distinguishing mark of the Apostles; so it is only the leaders, and no others, who are to be seen performing this act."

And a few sentences after Chrysostom contrasts

afresh the grace given in Holy Baptism with this power entrusted to the Apostles:—

"You see that it is not so simple a matter, but requires great power, to be able to give the Holy Ghost. It is not the same thing to obtain remission of sins, and to receive such power as this."[1]

We must return to the examination of this somewhat confusing and contradictory language by and by, after setting forth one or two other passages which may help either to confuse still further or to clear.

In his remarks upon the words in the sixth chapter of the Epistle to the Hebrews, S. Chrysostom states simply the value of the Laying on of Hands.

"'And of Laying on of Hands.' For thus they used to receive the Spirit:—'When Paul had laid his hands upon them,' it says"—

And then:—

"See in what a deterrent and forbidding way he begins;—'It is impossible.' Do not, he says, expect

[1] *Hom. in Act.* xviii. pp. 143–145 (Migne). The text appears to be unsatisfactory in parts. In the words *ὅθεν καὶ τοὺς κορυφαίους, οὐκ ἄλλους τινάς, ἔστιν ἰδεῖν τοῦτο ποιοῦντας*, it might perhaps appear as if Chrysostom meant that the administration of the gift of the Spirit was confined to the bishops in the current Church life of his day. It would then be observable that he would not be a witness for the identity of the *rite* by which the gift is given, but only for the identity of the gift and of its ministers; he says nothing about the mode of conveyance. But it is much more probable that his *ἔστιν ἰδεῖν* refers to the phenomena to be observed in the Scripture history, as is the case in the passage quoted above, p. 364, *ὕδατι βαπτιζομένους αὐτοὺς ἔστιν εὑρεῖν*. When he says *διὰ τὸ μήπω λαβεῖν πνεῦμα ἅγιον*, I am inclined to think that the "subject" of *λαβεῖν* is not the same as that of *ὑστέρουν*. Perhaps *αὐτοὺς* may have slipped out, meaning the Samaritans baptized by Philip.

what is not possible. He did not say, It is not fitting, inexpedient, unlawful; but, 'It is impossible;'—so as to throw them into despair,—'if indeed ye were once for all enlightened.' And then he adds, 'and tasted the heavenly gift' . . . that is, forgiveness of sins; 'and were made partakers of the Holy Ghost, and tasted the good word of God:'—here he speaks of the teaching given them:—'and powers of the world to come.' What powers does he mean? Either the performing of wonders, or the earnest of the Spirit."[1]

And in expounding what S. Paul said and did to the disciples of John at Ephesus, he remarks:—

"He did not say that the baptism of John was worthless, but that it was imperfect. And even this he did not say absolutely (ἁπλῶς, for the sake of saying it), but in order to teach and persuade them to be baptized into the name of Jesus. This they do, and receive the Spirit by the laying on of the hands of Paul; for it says, 'When Paul laid his hands on them, the Holy Ghost came upon them.' Thus, as a regular thing (*imperf. tense*), those on whom he laid his hands received the Holy Ghost. It is probable, therefore, that they had the Spirit, but in a latent manner (πνεῦμα μὲν αὐτοὺς ἔχειν, μὴ φαίνεσθαι δέ); and now they shewed Him forth (ἀλλὰ τοῦτο ἐνέφαινον) by their powerful operation and with the tongues which they spoke."[2]

[1] *Hom. in Hebr.* ix. p. 118 (Field). A good part of this passage appears among the fragments "attributed to" Athanasius in the Benedictine edition (vol. ii. p. 1272). But that fragment contains a good deal besides, and probably forms part of a homily or commentary by one of the numerous later imitators of S. Chrysostom.

[2] *Hom. in Act.* xl. p. 283 (Migne).

It is not easy to determine from these passages the exact position of Chrysostom with regard to Confirmation; but it is not inconceivable that he was inclined to regard the apostolic Laying on of Hands as a thing quite distinct from the Confirmation (by Unction) to which he was himself accustomed. It is not a thing of which he speaks as continued to his own day; he appears rather to regard it as a peculiar privilege of the Apostles. The gift conveyed by it is, in his estimation, a miraculous gift, no longer vouchsafed to the Church and, in some aspects, greater than anything now vouchsafed. He does indeed say that "the chief (κεφάλαιον) of good things" is given us in Baptism; yet he also speaks of our present participation of the Spirit, through Baptism,—sufficient as it is for moral needs,—as if it were less in measure than what was given in the earlier days. He draws a sharp line between "the performing of wonders" and "the earnest of the Spirit," when he names them as alternative interpretations of the phrase, "powers of the world to come" (ἢ . . . ἢ). And it is the former, "the Spirit of miracles," which he understands to have been conveyed by the imposition of the Apostles' hands. He may, therefore, have assumed that when Philip christened his Samaritan converts, he went through all the baptismal rites which were usual in his own day. He may have identified the receiving of the "Spirit of remission," even in their case, with "that coming of the Spirit which takes place after Baptism and before the Mysteries,"—with the possession of "the earnest of the Spirit." If this is the case,

and S. Chrysostom thought that the Samaritans were not only already baptized, but already confirmed before the arrival of S. Peter and S. John, then, indeed, he was assuredly mistaken, but it would explain the way in which he reduces the extent of the gift bestowed through the Apostles. It would then be easier to understand how he regarded the Laying on of Hands not as the sacrament of a new gift, but rather as the means of liberating, evoking, bringing into prominence, powers already inherent in those who received it. It may surprise us that he could find no middle term between "the Spirit of remission" and "the Spirit of miracles;" but if it be true that he considered the Baptism of the Samaritans to have been a normally complete Baptism, and the Imposition of Hands to have been only a thing of that age and of very limited purpose, then we must give a large interpretation (such as might well be supported) to the phrase, "the Spirit of remission." In any case we have the clear testimony of S. Chrysostom, when dealing not with facts of ancient history, but with contemporary practice and doctrine, testimony as to a well-known thing, to the coming of the Holy Spirit to take up His place in us at a point intermediate between Baptism itself and the Eucharistic Mysteries, by which coming we are "made to drink" the Spirit.[1]

[1] There is a passage in *Hom. in Phil.* v. p. 47 (Field) where S. Chrysostom, playing in a way that cannot be translated upon the words ἔλαιον (oil) and ἔλεος (mercy), says that the priests and kings and prophets of old days were anointed with oil, as a token "that the Spirit was afterwards to come (ἔρχεσθαι, make it His practice to come) into man through mercy (or oil δι' ἔλεον)."

The baptismal doctrine of Chrysostom's friend and fellow disciple, Theodore of Mopsuestia, presents many features of interest. He was a man of sharply defined and narrowly limited opinions, which he held tenaciously and expressed in constant repetitions of almost identical words. Baptism for him was the receiving of the Spirit, by which we are born again, and made partakers of the resurrection of Christ. Upon this he earnestly insists.[1] The signs of prophecy and tongues testified, according to him, in the first days, to the reality of the gift of the Spirit in Baptism. This was the great object of these miraculous displays. But Theodore appears nowhere to attempt any resolution of Baptism into its parts. The movement of grace in that sacrament appears to him one and indivisible. Once he speaks of the Chrism,[2] but in a way which does not directly refer to the ecclesiastical rite. On the other hand there is nothing to shew that he supposed the baptismal grace to be conveyed by the baptismal water apart from the subsequent rites. It is probable that he would have refused to divide the grace between them; for when he comments on the breathing of our Lord upon His disciples on the evening of Easter Day, he speaks contemptuously of the "foolish" opinion that our Lord really gave the Holy Spirit by that act,—which, to his mind, robbed Pentecost of its significance.[3] His friend S. Chrysostom,

[1] On the baptismal doctrine of Theodore, see Swete's edition of his commentary on the Minor Epistles of S. Paul, vol. i. p. lxxxiii.

[2] Upon *Eph.* i. 23.

[3] *Fragm. in Act.* (Migne *Patr. Gr.* vol. 66. p. 783).

on the other hand, was of opinion that the Paschal gift was "in order to make them capable of receiving Him, and sufficient for His entertainment."[1]

The learning of the school of Antioch passed from these two great teachers to a still more learned expositor in the person of Theodoret. Theodoret, like those whose disciple he was, inclined to the belief that the Holy Spirit was sometimes given in a latent manner and then by a subsequent act declared. He thus answers the question, "why the Lord God, having testified to Joshua that he had in him the Spirit of God, commanded Moses to lay his hand upon him."

"This was done also upon Cornelius; for after having received the grace of the Spirit, they were then admitted to Baptism. And in fact the Master Christ also, having according to His human nature received all the gracious gifts of the Spirit before the pains which brought Him to birth, came to the baptism of John, and ordered the hand of the servant to be laid upon His head, and displayed the most Holy Spirit coming upon Him in the shape of a dove. And the Apostles, after taking Holy Spirit by the Master's breathing upon them, received the grace which came upon them from heaven. This also was done upon Jesus the son of Nave. He had indeed the grace of the Spirit; but in order that the people also might believe that he had received from God the ordination to the leadership, the hands of the lawgiver were laid upon him."[2]

[1] *Hom. in Act.* i. p. 20 (Migne). [2] *Quaest. in Num.* 47.

It is remarkable how Theodoret assumes that the baptism of John included an imposition of hands not explicitly mentioned in Scripture. In all probability he did not think of it as a distinct rite, but rather as a necessary gesture in the act of baptising. Chrysostom himself, who is so far from recognising the Imposition of Hands in the full sense of Confirmation, speaks of such a gesture as this: "When thou art baptized," he says, "it is not the priest himself who baptizeth thee; it is God who holdeth thy head with unseen power."[1] S. John Damascene affirms that "John was baptized by laying his hand upon the Lord's divine head."[2] No doubt however it was the thought of what was done to Joshua which caused Theodoret to specify this gesture, and he connects it with the descent of the Spirit upon Christ, though disposed to evacuate the significance of that descent. We may, therefore, compare the passage with what Theodoret says about the doctrine of the Laying on of Hands in the Epistle to the Hebrews:—

"Those who have believed, abominating the ill savour of those [dead works], and using penitence, approach the divine Baptism, and through the priestly hand receive as a guest the grace of the Spirit (*διὰ τῆς ἱερατικῆς χειρὸς ὑποδέχονται τὴν χάριν τοῦ πνεύματος*), and receiving in the divine Baptism the figure of the resurrection they await the general resurrection of all, and the judgment to come. These things he called the alphabet of the oracles."[3]

[1] *Hom. in Matt.* l. p. 517 B: *ὁ κατέχων σου τὴν κεφαλήν.*
[2] *De Fid. Orth.* p. 262 (Le Quien).
[3] *Comm. in loc.*

Perhaps it is not unworthy of notice that Theodoret shrinks from using in his paraphrase the expression which would have affirmed that "the priestly hand" was still employed in precisely the same way as in the days when the Epistle to the Hebrews was written. He does not say "through the laying on of the priestly hand." But, however the hand is employed, he recognises clearly the gift conveyed by it as being still the same, and as conveyed in the course of Baptism. Otherwhere, he naturally associates the gift with the baptismal Unction :—

"If you care for a more mystical meaning, remind yourself of the sacred initiation (*μυσταγωγίας*), in which those who are being initiated (*τελούμενοι*), after the renunciation of the usurper and the confession of the King, receive, as it were a kind of royal seal, the Unction of the spiritual ointment,—receiving in the ointment as a figure the invisible grace of the most Holy Spirit (*ὡς ἐν τύπῳ τῷ μύρῳ τὴν ἀόρατον τοῦ παναγίου πνεύματος χάριν ὑποδεχόμενοι*)."[1]

Commenting upon the 23rd Psalm, Theodoret repeats what he finds in Eusebius, quoted above.[2] Reference has already been made[3] to his statement that the

[1] *In Cant. Cant.* i. 2. It might, perhaps, appear at first, from the mention of this unction as following upon the "renunciation and confession," as if Theodoret meant the unction preceding Baptism, which, as we have seen, is treated as distinctly sacramental by Cyril of Jerusalem and the *Apostolic Constitutions*. But this is made impossible by his using the word *μύρον*. The preliminary unction was not made with *μύρον*. Probably the close juxtaposition of the Unction with the transfer of allegiance, the Baptism itself being omitted, is due to Theodoret's wish to make plain the connexion of the "seal" with the Christian profession.

[2] p. 333. [3] p. 118.

Novatianists did not use Unction in the course of Baptism (τοῖς ὑπὸ σφῶν βαπτιζομένοις τὸ πανάγιον οὐ προσφέρουσι χρίσμα); on account of which, converts from that sect were ordered to be anointed on joining the Church.[1] Here, once more, Confirmation is regarded as forming part of the Christian's initiation, not a thing given to one already well within the Church. It is to Theodoret, as to every ancient father, a part of the baptismal sacrament. Accordingly he interprets S. Paul's comparison of the baptism of Israel with ours in a way which it would be difficult to surpass for clearness and point.

"Those things, he says, were a type of ours. The sea represented (ἐμιμεῖτο) the font; the cloud represented the grace of the Spirit."[2]

It may be observed that "the grace of the Spirit" is no mere paraphrase for "grace"; but seems to be Theodoret's constant expression for the possession, or indwelling, of the Spirit.

To the testimony of these Greek fathers of Antioch may be added an expression or two of contemporary Greek teachers elsewhere.

Asterius, Bishop of Amasea in Pontus, contemporary with S. Chrysostom, in an interesting passage where the language of regeneration is applied in a secondary sense to conversion, sets clearly forth the difference between Baptism itself and the act which conveys the gift of the Holy Ghost, and yet as clearly conjoins the two together as both entering into the

[1] *Haer. Fab. Comp.* iii. 5.
[2] *In* 1 Cor. x. 2.

new baptismal birth. He is speaking of the return of the Prodigal Son.

"The robe—the first robe, would be—not actually Baptism, for it is not possible to have a second Baptism; but that first robe and grace which at the outset each of the faithful puts on through Baptism. For instead of the regeneration which comes by the laver, was graciously bestowed upon us from God the new birth which comes by repentance, which washes our defilements with weeping, and presents us clean again. There is given also to the Prodigal, after the robe, a ring,—a symbol of the invisible seal of the Spirit. For as in the regeneration by Baptism there is both robe and seal of the gift of the Holy Ghost, so is it also in the new birth by repentance."[1]

Gennadius, Patriarch of Constantinople, who came to his throne in the middle of the fifth century, about the same year in which Theodoret died, comments upon the foundation passage in the Epistle to the Hebrews in language which presents a few coincidences with Theodoret's, though these seem to be accidental:—

"He means that in the case of those who come now for the first time to the faith, we lay before them the teaching concerning these things like as it were a foundation, urging them first, as is natural, to repent from works that cause death; and, repenting, to believe upon God; and believing, to be baptized; and,

[1] Apud Phot. *Bibl.* cod. cclxxi. The phrase, *σφραγὶς δωρεᾶς πνεύματος ἁγίου*, was no doubt by this time the "form" of Confirmation; the so-called Seventh Canon of Constantinople cannot have first made it so (see p. 363 note).

in being baptized (βαπτιζομένους), to submit themselves to the Laying on of the priestly Hands for partaking of the Spirit; and, after partaking of the Spirit (μετασχόντας), no longer to doubt concerning the resurrection from the dead."[1]

Thus Gennadius speaks as if the "Laying on of the priestly Hands" were still a practice of his own day, and reckons it a part of Baptism, and that part which confers the Holy Ghost.

Before passing on to the examination of a great unknown author who has exerted a strangely powerful influence upon the subsequent history of doctrine, infusing into it the ardent mysticism of the East, we may return for a moment to the fourth century and to the famous schools which lay beyond Antioch, whose language was not Greek, but Syriac. It is thought that the great unknown author himself had learned in those schools, and therefore it would be of interest to know what the earlier doctors in them had to say upon the subject before us.[2]

The only father of the Syrian Church, in whom I have been able to discover any clear references to the doctrine of Confirmation, is S. Ephraem. He refers not unfrequently to the baptismal Unction, and always in the same kind of terms as more Western authors. Thus, after giving the literal interpretation of Joel's promise of the presses abounding with wine and oil, he says:—

"This place has a secret signification, by which you

[1] Apud Oecum. *in loc.*

[2] The evidence of the Syriac Liturgies is reserved for an appendix.

may understand that whatever good things are here promised to the Jews, Christ has bestowed upon the people upon whom He had bestowed salvation, that is, upon His Church,—corn, I say, wine, and mystic oil;—corn, which is the mystery of His most holy Body, and His sanctifying Blood in wine; oil also for a most sweet ointment with which those who have just been christened are sealed, and put on the armour of the Holy Ghost."[1]

What virtue this saint attached to the unction may be gathered from an earnest sermon of his, of which the following is a part:—

"Take heed that death come not up into thy windows (*i.e.* the senses) and break into thy house, and, having gained a hold on these, mar the form of the image, beloved of God, after which thou wast made. The entrances of thy head are sealed with the seal of the Holy Ghost; the mark of the Unction has been impressed upon all thy members. As an epistle of His own the King hath written thee, and sealed thee with His fiery signets; see that no strangers read that letter or break what He has stamped on thee; beware that thou undo not the King's signet; if thou do, the thieves will soon fall upon thee; see that thou obliterate not His impress, or thou wilt fall under the attack of the murderers. What is within thee, consider thine; what is without thee is at least not thine. Within thee is God; without thee is the devil. John in his Apocalypse saw a book, great and wonderful, written by God and

[1] *In Ioel* cap. ii. (Caillau vol. ii. p. 554).

guarded with seven seals. There was none who could read what was written; that secret, impenetrable to things above and to things below, was known only to the Son of God who had written and sealed it; for no eyes might ever see, nor ears hear, nor minds in thought comprehend the good things which God hath written for the soul. He hath written His kingdom in the soul, and laid up the writing there as an earnest, until the heir of the kingdom, the Son of God, shall come, and take the soul into His bridal chamber."[1]

In the latter part of the fifth century, when the race of the great theologians was over, both in East and West, a fresh impetus was given to speculative divinity by the mysterious personage who assumed the name and position of Denys the Areopagite. Who this remarkable writer was, and where he came from, must remain uncertain; but Dr. Westcott, in a suggestive study upon him, finds reason to think that he belonged to the celebrated school of Edessa.[2] The name which this man took was wisely chosen for his purpose. Though, when first quoted in support of Monophysite positions, his works were received with suspicion by the orthodox, they soon acquired all the weight due to the cultured Athenian disciple of S. Paul; and, through Thomas Aquinas and the Council of Trent, not to mention others, they have profoundly influenced the teaching of the whole Latin communion.

[1] *Serm. Exeget.* vi. (Caillau vol. iii. p. 26).

[2] The essay is republished in the volume of *Essays in the History of Religious Thought in the West.*

Denys, in his *Ecclesiastical Hierarchy*, gives a summary account of the baptismal rites, no doubt taken simply enough from the usage of the day and country, though Pachymeres apologizes for its differing from that with which he and his readers were conversant. After the triple immersion,

"The priests take [the baptized] and deliver him to the sponsor and author of his reception; and in conjunction with him, they clothe the man who is being initiated (τῷ τελουμένῳ) with suitable raiment and lead him back to the hierarch. He, after sealing the man with the God-making ointment (τῷ θεουργικωτάτῳ μύρῳ), finally makes him partaker of the Eucharist which completes consecration (τῆς ἱεροτελεστικωτάτης εὐχαριστίας)."[1]

Perhaps the author did not intend to convey quite so definite a meaning in his inflated adjectives as is here given; and Pachymeres, in his paraphrase, flattens them down into the commonplace "holy ointment" and "immortal mysteries." But it is worth while to observe that the confirmatory Unction is, as usual, part of the "mystery of enlightenment" which is the subject in hand:—the man is still τελούμενος, in the course of being initiated. Yet in the "Contemplation" which follows, the Areopagite gives the following comment upon the rite:—

"The perfecting Unction with the ointment (ἡ τοῦ μύρου τελειωτικὴ χρίσις) makes him who has been initiated (τὸν τετελεσμένον) of a sweet savour; for the sacred perfecting of the God-birth (ἡ ἱερὰ τῆς θεογενεσίας

[1] *De Eccl. Hier.* ii. 7.

τελείωσις) unites the things initiated (τὰ τελεσθέντα) with the Divinely-sovereign Spirit. That coming (ἐπιφοίτησιν), which imparts the spiritual sweet odour and makes complete (τελεσιουργόν), is far beyond description, and I leave it to be spiritually known by those who have mercifully received in spirit the sacred, God-making communion of the Divine Spirit."[1]

Here, according to the most natural interpretation, the neophyte is regarded as already initiated, by Baptism, before he reaches the point where Confirmation is administered; yet the θεογενεσία—the new birth which makes us Gods—is not perfect without it. "The things which were initiated" by the act of Baptism are not yet "united with the sovereign Spirit;" they still await His "coming," and His "communion which makes us divine." This they receive by the Unction which follows.

Out of the seven chapters which compose the treatise on the Ecclesiastical Hierarchy, a whole chapter,—besides these passages in the chapter on Baptism,—is devoted to the subject of the sacred Unguent and its consecration. This consecration is said to "rank along with" that of the Synaxis or Eucharist (ὁμοιοταγής). It is (like that of the Eucharist) prefaced by the dismissal of those who are not full Christians, by processions through the whole temple with incense, and psalmody, and lections. The unguent is set on the altar, covered with twelve

[1] *Ibid.* contempl. § 8. It is from this passage that Jeremy Taylor takes the name of his Discourse on Confirmation.

veils, which symbolize the Seraphim of Isaiah's vision —a symbolism which the Areopagite explains at great length. When the consecration has been duly effected, this compound of oil and perfumes is used "for the hallowing of every sacred thing,"—of the font itself, and of the altar:—but its chief use is, of course, in the completion of the baptismal sacrament.

"Even the completing gift and grace of the sacred God-birth is performed by means of the Divine perfectings of the ointment."

And again:—

"Upon him also that has received the most sacred initiation of the God-birth, the perfecting Unction with the ointment bestows the coming of the divinely sovereign Spirit (*αὐτῷ τῷ τελεσθέντι τὴν ἱερωτάτην τῆς θεογενεσίας τελετὴν τὴν τοῦ θεαρχικοῦ πνεύματος ἐπιφοίτησιν ἡ τοῦ μύρου δωρεῖται τελειωτικὴ χρίσις*)." [1]

It will be noted by those who refer to the context of these sentences, that the Areopagite does not inculcate the truths contained in them for their own sake, but uses them, as acknowledged beliefs, to serve as a basis for further developments of his own. His doctrine of Confirmation, when stripped of its tedious magniloquence, is the universal doctrine of antiquity.

For any practical purpose in guiding the thought of the Church of our day it is unnecessary to come to later writers than those whom I have now cited. The patristic doctrine will by this time be abundantly clear: subsequent authors can add but little authority to what the first ages so emphatically

[1] *De Eccl. Hier.* iv. § 10, 11.

delivered. A few words, however, may be given from some of the more distinguished Greek authors of a later time, to indicate the general course of thought upon the baptismal sacrament or sacraments.

Anastasius of Sinai, late in the seventh century,—nearly coeval, that is, with Hildefonsus or Bede whose voices we have heard in the West,—gives the same reason which had often been given before him for not rebaptizing heretics :—

"If this were done, a man would not readily return from heresy, for shame of being rebaptized. But the Holy Ghost knows also how to come by means of Laying on of the Hands of the priest with prayer, as the Acts of the Apostles testify."[1]

The language is almost the language of the *De Rebaptismate;* and among other things will be observed, both in Anastasius and in some other late Greek writers, a tendency to return upon the title of the Laying on of Hands, instead of the Chrism, although there is no need to suppose that any corresponding change of practice was introduced.

Thus the great Damascene, in the middle of the eighth century,—himself the Bede or the Alcuin of the East—reverts to the ancient title, though in a form more commonly used to describe the ceremony of Ordination than that of Confirmation. One of the errors of the Massalians—a sect of Oriental Quietists, or perhaps in some aspects nearer to the modern dervishes—was to continue praying until

[1] *Quaest.* 86: πλὴν καὶ δι' ἐπιθέσεως τῶν χειρῶν τοῦ ἱερέως δι' εὐχῆ; οἶδεν ἐπιφοιτᾷν τὸ πν. τὸ ἅγ.

"They receive the entrance of the Holy Ghost again in a way perceptible to sense, and have in the soul an evident sense of the Spirit's entrance. And they say that this is the true communion of Christians; for that in the Church's Baptism or the Layings on of the Hands of the clergy the persons undergoing Baptism in no way partake of the Holy Ghost, unless they diligently take part in the prayers offered by them, and that a man may receive the communion of the Holy Ghost without Baptism at all."[1]

The wording of the passage is very careful. S. John Damascene does not say, as a man might easily have said, "neither in the Church's Baptism, *nor* in the Layings on of the Hands of the clergy (οὐδὲ . . . οὐδέ)." This would have implied that the gift might be expected to be given in either separately, or in both together. As it is, the Imposition of Hands is specified as that act in the baptismal service by which the Church expected the gift to be given.[2]

How completely the Damascene considered the Laying on of Hands, and the gifts conferred by it, to be a part of Baptism, is witnessed by his note upon 1 Thess. v. 23:—

"By the 'Spirit,' he means the gift (χάρισμα) which each received through Baptism. For in those days each person baptized received a gift, and worked signs. . . . He prays therefore that this gift, which

[1] Io. Damasc. *De Haer.* p. 97 (Le Quien): οὐδὲ γὰρ ἐν τῷ βαπτίσματι τῆς ἐκκλησίας ἢ ταῖς τῶν κληρικῶν χειροτονίαις ἁγίου πνεύματος πάντως μεταλαμβάνειν τοὺς βαπτιζομένους.

[2] The correlative to the οὐδὲ is not the ἤ, but the καὶ before λαβεῖν ἄν τινα καὶ δίχα τοῦ βαπτίσματος.

he calls their 'Spirit,' may abide in them whole, that they may in no way be deprived of the inworking of the Holy Ghost." [1]

Or again, even where he distinguishes between various benefits of Baptism :—

"The remission of sins, indeed, is given to all equally through Baptism, but the grace of the Spirit according to the proportion of faith and of preparatory cleansing. At the time, we receive through Baptism the firstfruits of the Holy Ghost, and our regeneration becomes to us the beginning of a different life, and a seal, and a safeguard, and an illumination. But we must with all our power keep ourselves safely clean from foul deeds." [2]

It must not be argued from such expressions that S. John considered these blessings—the "gift" or "Spirit" by which the first Christians worked signs, or "the grace of the Spirit" which is proportioned to our capacity for receiving and using it—to be given in the baptismal water apart from the complementary rite. They are given through a Baptism which includes Confirmation, administered by "the Layings on of the hands of the clergy," and by the Unction which he proceeds to mention within a few lines of the passage last quoted :—

"The oil (ἔλαιον) is used along with Baptism, signifying our unction, and making us christs, and promising us the mercy (ἔλεον) of God through the Holy Ghost; because to those who were saved from the Deluge the dove brought a twig of olive (ἐλαίας)." [3]

[1] *In Epp. Paul.* p. 221. [2] *De Fid. Orth.* p. 261. [3] *Ibid.* p. 262.

A century and a half later, came the great schism between East and West. One of the great causes, or at least one of the alleged occasions of it, was the contemptuous way in which the Latins treated the confirmations of the Greeks. As being administered by simple priests, they considered it null and void, and reconfirmed the Bulgarians who had been recently converted to the faith by Greek missionaries. Photius raises an indignant outcry against what he describes as an unparalleled sacrilege, and argues that to deny to the priest the authority to confirm is to deny his priesthood altogether. In language highly coloured by recollections of the Areopagite, he says:

"He consecrates the body and blood of the Lord Christ, and with these sanctifies again those who were before admitted to the secret; how shall he not sanctify by anointing with the ointment those who are now in course of initiation (*τοὺς νῦν τελουμένους*)? The priest baptizes, fully accomplishing upon the baptized the purifying gift; how, when he is the rightful accomplisher of the purification, will you deprive him of the guard and seal of it?"[1]

Here the redoubtable Patriarch seems to make Baptism the greater thing. It is an *a fortiori* argument with him that if a man can baptize, he can also confirm. Nevertheless, Photius is not at all inclined to acknowledge the validity of lay Confirmations, though in certain circumstances he allows of lay Baptism. If the layman has baptized presumptuously, without necessity,

[1] *Epist.* I. xiii. 7.

"We judge those who were baptized to have in no wise received the grace of the Spirit; and therefore we decide that they be both baptized in water, and anointed with the holy ointment, and so be perfected."

If on the other hand the Baptism has been performed in a heathen country by a layman for lack of a priest, it is not to be repeated, but the Unction must.[1] It is assumed that the layman will have anointed as well as baptized.

Photius frankly and simply traces the gift of the Holy Spirit to the apostolic act of Confirmation, when, commenting on Heb. vi. 1, 2, he says :—

"The word of Christ. What word? The word of the doctrine that we must lay a foundation of repentance from dead works; the word of the doctrine that we must believe upon God; the word of the doctrine that we must be baptized; the word of the doctrine that we must obtain (ἀξιωθῆναι) the Holy Ghost; the word of the doctrine that there will be a resurrection, and that there will be a judgment."[2]

I shall conclude this review of the teaching of the ancient fathers of the Eastern Church with a few extracts from two famous commentators, who, without much originality, but with much judgment, gathered up the exegetical teaching of former generations.

Oecumenius, a Thessalian prelate at the end of the tenth century, gives us these notes :—

On Acts ii. 38 :—

"Let each one of you be baptized, he says; for

[1] *Epist.* I. xviii. 1. [2] Apud Oecum. *in loc.*

this is the foundation of those who believe in Christ. This, then, he receives first; and after this he proceeds to that which is the finish to the foundation (*τὸ πρὸς τῷ θεμελίῳ τέλος*), and speaks of the gift of the Holy Ghost, because by means of this their faith is shewn."

On Heb. v. 1, 2 :—

"He calls Baptism the beginning, and the Laying on of Hands and Seal which takes place in it (*καὶ τὴν ἐν αὐτῷ τῶν χειρῶν ἐπίθεσιν καὶ σφραγῖδα*)."

On 1 John ii. 20 :—

"For by means of Holy Baptism, ye received the sacred Chrism, and thereby the Divine Spirit which leads you into all the truth."

Theophylact, who, about two hundred years after the time of Photius, was Exarch of that Bulgarian Church over which Rome and the East had fought, repeats word for word the remarks of S. Chrysostom upon 1 Cor. xii. 13 which I have given above,[1] referring the "drinking" of the Spirit to that "coming" which takes place between Baptism and the first Communion.

On Acts viii. 17, he says :—

"It is to be noted that after the Baptism, the Holy Ghost comes upon those who are being baptized into the name of the Lord Jesus, by the Laying on of Hands with prayer. Wherefore also to this day the order is thus preserved (*ἡ τάξις οὕτω φυλάττεται*)."

Upon 2 Cor. i. 21 he remarks :—

"For such is every one on being baptized [namely prophet, priest, and king];—prophet, as having seen

[1] See p. 365.

what eye never saw, nor ear heard; priest as bound to offer himself a living sacrifice, holy, acceptable to God; and king as having been made a son of God the King of all, and an heir of the kingdom to come, and as now reigning over wrong thoughts and being superior to the whole world. As, therefore, the ancient priests and kings were anointed with the oil, so now we also were anointed with the Spirit, God having given in our hearts the earnest of the Spirit."

As the eye runs once more over the teaching of the Greek and Oriental Fathers here set forth, one thing at least is apparent. For very many centuries the Christians of the East have never been forced to define to themselves at all clearly the position of a person baptized but unconfirmed. Their mode of administering Confirmation by the hands of the baptizing presbyter—though, among the Greeks and some others, with chrism prepared by the bishop—relieves them from the necessity which weighs upon us Westerns, of teaching Christian children what their status is between the two rites. Confirmation is for them, far more than it has been for a long while in the West, a factor in Baptism. Only a more or less conscious desire not to fall behind Western teachers in honouring the perfecting Unction can have led their later authorities to treat that Unction as a sacrament numerically distinct from Baptism. To all the early doctors of the East the two things are one; and Baptism culminates in the Unction. The tendency among Oriental Christians was, not to attribute to Baptism in our modern sense, the gift

of the Holy Ghost, but rather to consider Baptism by itself as a bare rite, benefiting the body alone, and dependent for its spiritual efficacy upon other actions, after and before. Not that this tendency has its full way. The Greek Fathers may be said certainly on the whole to trace the forgiveness of sins, the preparatory cleansing, to the baptismal laver; the gift of the Holy Ghost, for the ordinary purposes of Christian living, they trace, like S. Chrysostom, to that act which comes "immediately after Baptism, and before the Mysteries."

APPENDIX III.

OFFICES OF BAPTISM AND CONFIRMATION IN THE EASTERN CHURCHES.

I. The Greek Church.

A distinguishing feature of the Greek baptismal offices is to be found in the long and frequent addresses of exhortation and instruction delivered at the beginning by the "Archbishop"—that is, of Constantinople. Amidst these addresses come the usual renunciation of the devil and confession of faith, and then, after certain prayers, an imposition of hands upon all who are ready for Baptism.[1] Presently the deacon begins a litany in which among others the following petitions occur :—

"That this water may be sanctified by the power and operation and coming of the Holy Ghost. That the grace of redemption, the blessing of Jordan may be sent down upon it. That the cleansing operation of the super-essential Trinity may come down upon these waters. That we may be enlightened with the enlightenment of knowledge and godliness by the coming of the Holy Ghost. For him who now comes to the holy enlightenment, and for his salvation. That he may be made a son of light and an heir of good things. That he may be planted together and made partaker of the death and resurrection of Christ

[1] Asseman *Cod. Lit.* vol. i. p. 111 foll. The order of Baptism itself, and of Confirmation, will be found in vols. ii. and iii. respectively.

our God. That he may preserve the robe of Baptism, and the earnest of the Spirit, unspotted and unblameable in the terrible day of Christ our God. That this water may be made to him a washing of regeneration, unto remission of sins and a robe of incorruption."

These petitions are not carefully sorted, or arranged after an intelligible order. They appear to contemplate a Baptism in which the various movements of mercy are supposed to be inextricably blended together. The priest meanwhile has been silently praying for himself, and then proceeds with the prayer of consecration of the water :—

"O Lord of all things, make this a water of redemption, a water of sanctification, the cleansing of flesh and spirit, the loosing of bonds, the remission of trespasses, the enlightenment of souls, the laver of regeneration, the renewing of the Spirit, the grace of adoption, the robe of incorruption, the fountain of life. For Thou, Lord, hast said, 'Wash you, make you clean ; put away the evil from your souls.' Thou didst bestow on us the new birth from above, by water and the Holy Ghost. Manifest Thyself, O Lord, upon this water, and grant that he who is baptized in it may be made anew (*μεταποιηθῆναι*), unto putting away the old man, which corrupteth according to the lusts of deceit, and unto putting on the new, which is renovated according to the image of Him that created him ; in order that being planted together in the likeness of His death through Baptism, he may be made partaker also of His resurrection, and having guarded the gift of Thy Holy Spirit, and having increased the grace committed to him, he may receive the prize of the high calling, and be numbered among the firstborn which are enrolled in heaven."

Immediately after this comes the blessing of the oil, —to be of course distinguished from the chrism, which was consecrated only during the Eucharist of Maundy Thursday :—

"O Lord, the Lord God of our fathers, who didst send to them who were in Noah's ark a dove with a twig of olive in her mouth as a symbol of reconciliation, and didst thereby prefigure the mystery both of salvation from the flood and of grace; and didst supply the fruit of the olive for the fulfilment of Thy holy mysteries; Thou who by it didst both fill those that were under the law with the Holy Spirit, and dost perfect those that are in grace; Bless Thou this present oil, by the power and operation and coming of Thy Holy Ghost, so that it may be made a chrism of incorruption, an armour of righteousness, renovation of soul and body, a turning away of all operation of the devil, unto riddance of all evils, unto them that are anointed with it or partake of it."

The oil is poured thrice upon the water in the form of a cross, and then the candidate for Baptism is presented to the priest, who signs him with it crosswise on the brow and breast and back, saying,

"The servant of God, N., is anointed with the oil of gladness In the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Ghost, now and ever and world without end. Amen."

Other parts of the body are then similarly "sealed," each unction being accompanied by a formula of comparatively recent introduction; and then comes the actual Baptism, without any further prayers intervening, in the precisely parallel form:—

"The servant of God, N., is baptized In the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Ghost, now and ever and world without end. Amen."

The priest then washes his hands, singing with the people the Psalm, "Blessed is he whose unrighteousness is forgiven and whose sin is covered;" and then the baptized is clothed with the same formula:—

"The servant of God, N., is clothed with the garment

of righteousness In the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Ghost, now and ever and world without end. Amen."

After which is sung the *troparion*,

"Give me a shining garment, Thou that deckest Thyself with light as with a garment, most merciful Christ, our God."

And then follows the Confirmation.

"And after he is clothed the priest proceeds to pray this prayer :—

"Blessed art Thou, O Lord God Almighty, the Fountain of good, the Sun of righteousness, who didst cause the light of salvation to shine on them that were in darkness, through the appearing of Thy only begotten Son our God, and didst bestow on us, unworthy though we be, the blessed cleansing in the holy water, and the divine sanctification in the life-giving chrism; Who hast now also vouchsafed to regenerate Thy servant, the newly enlightened, by water and the Holy Ghost, and hast given unto him the remission of his sins both voluntary and involuntary; Do Thou, O Lord, the compassionate King of all, bestow on him the seal of the gift of Thine holy and almighty and adorable Spirit, and the partaking of the holy body and precious blood of Thy Christ; keep him in Thy santification, confirm him in the orthodox faith, deliver him from the evil one and all his devices, and preserve his soul, by Thy saving fear, in purity and righteousness; that pleasing Thee in every work and word, he may be made a son and heir of Thy heavenly kingdom.

"And after the prayer, he anoints the baptized (*τὸν βαπτισθέντα*) with the holy Ointment, making the sign of the cross upon the forehead, and the eyes, and the nostrils, and the mouth, and the two ears, and the breast, and the hands, and the feet, saying :—

"The seal of the gift of the Holy Ghost. Amen."

To these formularies must be added the Prayer of Consecration of the Chrism, which is performed with circumstances of the greatest solemnity.

"O Lord of mercy and Father of lights, from whom is given every good bestowal and every perfect gift, grant to us, unworthy though we be, grace for the ministry of this great and life-giving mystery, as Thou gavest unto Moses Thy faithful minister and Samuel Thy servant, and unto Thy holy Apostles; and send down Thy most Holy Spirit upon this ointment. Make it a royal chrism, a spiritual chrism, to preserve life, to sanctify souls and bodies, an oil of gladness which indeed went before in the law but shone forth in the new Covenant; wherewith were anointed priests and high priests, prophets and kings; through which also Thou didst Thyself anoint Thy holy Apostles, and all who through the laver of regeneration were by them and by the bishops and presbyters who came after them begotten anew, until this day. And O Lord, Almighty God, make it by the coming of Thy holy and adorable Spirit a robe of incorruption, and a seal which maketh perfect, stamping upon those who receive Thy Divine washing the Divine naming of Thee and of Thy only begotten Son and of the Holy Ghost; that they may be known in Thy sight, of Thy household, and citizens, bondmen and servants of Thine, sanctified in soul and body, being rid of all vice, and redeemed from all sin, by the investiture of the robe of Thy undefiled glory, to be known by means of this holy signing by the holy angels and archangels, and by every heavenly power, and to be terrible to the evil and unclean demons; that they may be a people of possession, a royal priesthood, a holy nation, sealed through this undefiled mystery of Thine, and having Thy Christ in their hearts, for an habitation of Thee our God and Father in the Holy Spirit; for Thou art holy, O our God, and dost rest in them that are holy, and to Thee we ascribe

glory, the Father, and the Son, and the Holy Ghost, now and ever and world without end. Amen."[1]

Perhaps no Church has gone so far, in its public offices, to obscure the primitive doctrine of Baptism and Confirmation as the Greek, running the two into one, and transferring so much of the blessing of Confirmation to the unction which precedes Baptism. Yet even here the difference is not lost sight of. Not a word is said which implies the giving of the Holy Ghost by means of the baptismal immersion. The primæval prayer still follows the Baptism, that He who has vouchsafed to regenerate the neophyte by water and the Holy Ghost, and has given him forgiveness of sins, will proceed to bestow upon him the gift of the Spirit.

II. The Armenian Church.

In the Armenian Church, after the renunciation and profession, the clergy go to the altar, and the Chrism, which has been already "prepared," is blessed.

"Let us beseech the Lord that the Holy Spirit may come down upon this oil.

"Blessed art Thou, O Lord our God, who hast chosen a new people for Thyself, to be a priesthood, and to be a kingdom, a holy nation, a peculiar people, even as of old Thou didst anoint priests, and prophets, and kings, with the like most holy oil. And now we pray Thee, O Lord, in mercy send the graces of Thy Holy Spirit upon this oil, that he who shall be therewith anointed, may be cleansed, and fortified with spiritual wisdom in the conflict, that he may triumph over the adversary, and may be endowed with virtue in the keeping of the commandments, in the perfect exercise of the work of honesty and piety; so that being enlightened in the understanding, and living in good

[1] Habert *Pontificale Eccl. Graec.* p. 696, or Goar *Euchol.* p. 628.

manners in this world, to the salvation of his soul and the honour and glory of the most Holy Trinity, he may be found worthy to obtain the company of those who love Thy name in Christ Jesus our Lord, to whom is due glory, dominion, and honour, now and ever, and world without end."

The water is then poured into the font, in the form of a cross, and after the Prophet, Epistle, and Gospel, a litany is said, resembling that in the Greek formulary, but containing no expressions which shew any special belief with regard to the respective parts of the sacrament; after which follows the benediction of the font:—

"Thou, O Lord, by Thy great power hast made the sea, and the dry land, and all creatures that are in them. Thou didst separate the waters that be above the firmament, and didst appoint them for a habitation of shining angels, which stand to glorify Thee continually. Thou didst also send Thy holy Apostles, bidding them to preach, and to baptize all nations in the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Ghost. Moreover Thou didst decree by Thine unfailing word that those who are not born again of water and the Spirit shall not see eternal life. And for fear thereof, this Thy servant, desiring everlasting life, cometh of his own accord to the spiritual Baptism of this water. Send forth, we pray, O Lord, Thy Holy Spirit upon this water, and sanctify it, as Thou didst sanctify Jordan by descending into it most clean from sins, O Lord Jesu Christ, to institute this fountain of Baptism for all men. Grant to this person, now being baptized, that this water may be for remission of sins, conferring the grace of adoption of sons of Thy heavenly Father, and the inheritance of the kingdom of heaven; so that being cleansed from sins, he may live according to the good pleasure of Thy will in this world, and may receive the boundless good things to come, and perpetually giving thanks with joy,

may glorify Thee with the Father and the Holy Ghost, now and ever, and world without end."

Chrism is then poured upon the water; the candidate is stripped, and the priest says :—

"Thou who hast called this Thy servant unto sanctification and the Baptism of illumination, vouchsafe to give him Thy great grace. Strip him of the oldness of sins, and renew him to new life; fill him with the virtue of the Holy Ghost unto renewal of the glory of Thy Christ. For to Thee is due, with Thy only begotten Son and the lifegiving Holy Spirit, glory, dominion, and honour, now and ever, and world without end.

"Then he places the infant in the font, and with his hand he pours of the water over his head, saying thrice :

"N. is baptized in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost. Redeemed by the blood of Christ from the bondage of sins, he obtaineth the liberty of the adoption of sons of the heavenly Father, that he may be made a co-heir of Christ, and a temple of the Holy Ghost, now and ever and world without end.

"Saying thus he thrice dips the candidate, thrice in the water burying the sins of old. It signifies also the three days' burial of Christ and the Resurrection. And washing the whole body, he says,

"Ye that are baptized in Christ, have put on Christ, Alleluia; ye that are illuminated in the Father, in you shall the Holy Ghost rejoice."

Then, after the reading of the conclusion of S. Matthew's Gospel, and the Lord's Prayer, comes the Confirmation.

"O God, who art great and everlasting, and knowest all hidden things; who art holy, and dwellest in them that art holy; O Saviour of all men, who dost grant to Thy faithful the knowledge of the truth, and hast given them power to become the sons of God by regeneration of water and the Spirit; with which (*quo*) Thou hast sweetly renewed this

Thy servant N. by Thy washing; sanctify him with Thy truth, and with the light of the graces of Thy Holy Spirit, that he may be made a temple and a habitation of Thy Godhead, and may be able with boldness to stand before the altar of Thy Only-begotten, our Lord Jesus Christ, with whom," etc.

"And afterwards he signs him with the sacred Chrism, first the brow, saying,

"The sweet oil poured out in the name of Jesus Christ upon thee, the seal of the heavenly gifts.

"(*Ears, saying*) Let it be an unction of sanctification for hearing the Divine commandments.

"(*Eyes*) Let this seal in the name of Christ enlighten thine eyes that thou mayest never sleep in death.

"(*Nostrils*) Let this seal of Christ be to thee an odour of sweetness of life unto life.

"(*Mouth*) Let this seal be a watch and a guarded door to thy lips.

"(*Hands held joined*) Let this seal of Christ be to thee a cause of good works and of virtuous manners.

"(*Breast*) Let this Divine seal confirm a clean heart in thee, and renew a right spirit in thy inward parts.

"(*Shoulder*) Let this seal in the name of Christ be to thee a shield of defence, by which thou mayest quench all the fiery darts of the wicked one.

"(*Feet*) Let this divine seal direct thy feet and thy steps unto eternal life.

"(*Shoulder blades*) He shall defend thee under His wings, and thou shalt be safe under His feathers.

"After this let him say, Peace be with thee. The baptized answers, And with thy spirit. Next he clothes him, and crowns him, and says this prayer:—

"O Lord God Almighty, Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, to Thee the faithful bow their heads. Stretch forth Thine invisible right hand and bless this person."

And then the prayer becomes general, and the Holy Communion ensues.

Asseman gives a second Armenian office of Baptism, somewhat longer than the first; but there is nothing specially remarkable in the differences. Perhaps the most interesting for our purpose is the more articulate expression in the prayer between Baptism and Confirmation :—

"And hast given them right to become the sons of God by new birth of water and the Spirit; whereby (*quibus*) Thou hast renewed this Thy servant, N. (*hoc nomine*), through the purification of Thy font. Fill him with the grace of Thy Spirit, that he may," etc.

Asseman (*Cod. Lit.* vol. iii. p. 124, note 1) says that as Baptism and Confirmation are administered together by the Armenians, the fact that they are separate sacraments is in common language generally unknown. The whole service bears the title of the "Seal," as culminating in so elaborate a form of Confirmation.

But the distinction between the two parts of the united sacrament is very fairly preserved. Though in the benediction of the Chrism, it is spoken of as "cleansing," as well as "fortifying," yet, when the more explicit language is used, the grace asked from the font itself is "remission of sins;" that it may "confer the grace of adoption, and the inheritance of the kingdom of heaven :"—the grace asked from the unction is, to be "sanctified with the truth and with the light of the graces of the Holy Spirit" (or according to the other form, to be "filled with the grace of the Holy Spirit") in order to be "a temple and a habitation for the Godhead." If it is (apparently) asked that in Baptism itself the man may be "filled with the virtue of the Holy Ghost," the scope of the prayer is immediately defined by the addition "unto renewal."[1] As Asseman

[1] The words which follow—"of the glory of Thy Christ"—are not easy to understand. If they are rightly given, perhaps they mean that

points out, the Armenian Church has no unction before Baptism. This has, no doubt, contributed to keeping the doctrine of the Seal the clearer.

III. The Syrian Churches (Chaldean, Nestorian, Malabarian).

It was affirmed by the Romanensian mission which invaded the Church of Malabar in the sixteenth century, that that ancient community had no acquaintance with the sacrament of Confirmation. Regulations regarding it formed, accordingly, a prominent feature in the Synod of Diamper (1599).[1]

But Asseman, within the Roman Communion, has pointed out how little foundation in fact there is for the assertion, and so has Renaudot in his *Perpétuité de la Foi.* More recently, Bickell, in the *Zeitschrift für Katholische Theologie* (1877 p. 85 foll.), has devoted an interesting article to Confirmation among the Nestorians. The accusation brought against the Syrian Church of Malabar might be brought with equal justice against the Armenian Church,—or, for that matter, against many of the Greek fathers. Confirmation was not known to them as a separate sacrament, standing by itself. But the ancient office books of the Christians of S. Thomas, as well as of their co-religionists near the Euphrates, shew that they have continuously preserved something answering to the rite, though it differs from the general usage both in respect to the minister—being consecrated by any presbyter—and also in respect to the matter—consisting only of oil olive, without the admixture of perfumes. Each

the glory of Christ is manifested in the renewal of fallen man through Baptism.

[1] See Geddes *History of the Church of Malabar* pp. 65, 209. My attention was first called to these regulations by the Rev. G. F. Hodges.

fresh consecration of oil, however, is effected by the infusion of some already consecrated, which is supposed to have been delivered down from the Apostles.

The prayers which precede Baptism in this office run to a great length, and though beautiful are very wordy.

After the *Pater Noster*, and a prayer to be enabled to administer aright, and a Psalm, the priest makes a first imposition of hands, prefaced by this prayer :—

"Stretch forth, O Lord our God, Thy right hand from Thy sanctuary on high, and bless and keep, of Thy clemency, these souls which expect to receive the gifts of Thy grace, O Lord of all."

The prayer accompanying this rite contains the expression that the candidates (like the good fish of the Parable) are "cast into the holy vessel of propitiatory Baptism" (a constant epithet in this office), "that by a new and spiritual generation they may be born again to the increase of their faith, and since their bodies are free from the taint of sin,[1] they may receive an unchangeable expiation, and be made members of Christ, and be fed at the table of His sacraments."

The transition here from the initial grace of Baptism to the Holy Eucharist seems very rapid. The candidates are then signed (with "the oil of unction," according to Badger) upon the face, with the words,

"N. is signed in the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Ghost."

All then enter the baptistry, and according to Badger's form, a kind of introit is sung in which the baptismal graces are more fully expressed :—

"The gates of the spiritual chamber of the Bridegroom are opened, for the forgiveness of the sins of men, and

[1] This seems a curious phrase; but Badger *Nestorians and their Rituals* vol. ii. p. 196, whose office differs in a good many details from Asseman's, has the same expression, "his body being undefiled by the filth of sin."

through the gift of the Spirit from on high mercy and peace are now vouchsafed to all mankind."

In the long prayer which follows, the Apostles are said to have had Baptism committed to them by Christ, who taught them "to make it a beginning of faith and a schoolmaster of the fear of God, and a sign of those who are converted from error to the acknowledgment of the truth; and the Apostles delivered this form to the priests and rulers of the flock of Christ that it might be to them a seal and a discipline[1] in every generation. Now therefore behold, many are prepared to receive the gift of Baptism for the confession of the precious passion of our Saviour,—their soul consenting in faith and charity to Him, who by regeneration has renewed our constitution, and forgiven our sin, and raised up our fall; and are expecting through the holy Seal and through propitiatory Baptism to be made members and partakers of the same likeness with Him who is the Head of the Church, and the Firstbegotten of the dead." God is asked to "send them the gift of the Spirit to strengthen the weakness of their nature, that they may not doubt the visible sacraments by which they receive future good things which pass not away."

Another prayer says that Christ was baptized in order to consecrate the waters, "that by His unseen power, and by the armour of the Spirit, which they put on from them (*ex iis*, from the waters, apparently[2]), Satan our enemy might be defeated by those who in faith are baptized in them"; and goes on to ask "that those who are about to receive the seal of life, renouncing Satan and all his works, and being perfected and completed in the true faith of the Father, and the Son, and the Holy Ghost, may be made worthy to receive this great and wonderful

[1] Badger: "a sign wherewith to make disciples."

[2] Badger has simply "the weapons of the Spirit wherewith those are endued who are baptized in faith."

gift, and may put off in the propitiatory Baptism the old man . . . and may in the laver of the holy waters put on the new . . . and may take from the holy altar the body and blood of Christ . . . keeping the gift of abundant mercies which they receive through the Spirit; so that He (the Spirit) may lead them from this world to the region of life and light, and that they may be made coheirs with Christ."

After this the water is poured into the font, and after Epistle and Gospel, and two litanies, follows a second laying on of hands, prefaced by a prayer that God would "pour out His gift through the hands" of the priest, and then the consecration of the oil.

"We pray Thee . . . that grace may come from the gift of the Holy Ghost, who is of Thee in the perfection of His person, and is partaker of Thy essence and Thy creative power, and may be mingled with this oil, and may bestow on all who are therewith anointed the earnest of resurrection from the dead, which is given for perfecting the adoption of sons, and for delivering from sinful affections, and for the pleasure of heavenly rest. For Thou by Thy wise guidance hast uplifted this world in the coming of Thy Christ to an understanding worthy of Thy Trinity, and hast given them a change of spiritual gifts which are meet for the acknowledgment of Thy faith. For the holy oil which Thou gavest to them of old for a seal and faculty of a temporal priesthood and a transitory kingship, that same Thou hast now committed to the priests of the Church to be a sign and figure of those who pass from earthly things to heavenly in an immortal body and an unchangeable soul, and are thereby circumcised with a circumcision made without hands, putting off the flesh of sin in the circumcision of Christ."

"So now also, O Lord, by Thy grace let this great and divine sacrament be accomplished, and let grace from the

gift of the Holy Ghost come, and dwell, and abide upon this oil, and bless it, and seal it, and sanctify it, in the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Ghost; and may this 'anointing oil' by the power of Thy grace be such that it may bestow on those who are anointed with it in the life-giving seal, in the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Ghost, perfect and true sanctification, and the high fellowship of the kingdom of heaven, by means of that Baptism, which is performed in the figure of the passion, death, and resurrection of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ."

The priest signs the vessel of oil upon the altar with oil from the horn of already consecrated oil, saying;

"This oil is sealed and mingled with the holy oil, that it may be a type of incorruptibility through propitiatory Baptism, in the name," etc.

They then proceed to consecrate the water, praying that "the Spirit Himself may come upon these waters, that they may receive virtue for the help and salvation of those who are baptized in them," and sign the water with the consecrated oil in the horn.

At length they pass on to direct action upon the candidates for Baptism. The priest with three fingers anoints them from the top downwards (according to Badger the reverse way) and from right to left saying;

"N. is anointed in the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Ghost."

The whole body is next anointed all over carefully, and immediately after, without intervening prayers, the candidate is placed in the font and baptized. In so doing the priest is bidden to lay his hand upon the head of the baptized;—according to the rubric in Badger, "so that his head may be submerged,"—a gesture which we have seen in Theodoret and others.

"Then the priest comes forth out of the door of the

screen, with the cross, the gospel, censer, lights, and the horn of unction, and the deacon says :

"Let us pray, Peace be with us.

"The priest prays :—

"Glory to Thee, O most High, who camest down and didst put on the body of our lowliness, and didst make it Thine in all things pertaining to Thy Divinity, and through it didst promise that Thou wouldest make us all heirs of Thy glory, and sharers of Thy honour, O Lord of all.

"And they begin the canon, O come let us sing unto the Lord, etc.

"From error, from sins, and from death, our Lord by His Baptism hath delivered us. Let us worship Him and praise Him.

"The priest recites this Imposition of the Hand, laying his hand upon each one of them, and saying :—

"Great, O Lord, and wonderful are the works of Thy Providence, and our reasonable nature is incapable of uttering them. For we, when we were first created, wickedly changed the honour of our freedom through the seduction of Satan who ravaged us, and the confession of Thy Godhead with the worshipping of him who is not God.[1] But Thy grace in no wise left us in the perdition which for our evil deeds we deserved ; but by the sending of the only-begotten God, Thy Word, in flesh, Thou didst bring us back to Thee, and madest us meet to acknowledge Thee ; Thou hast raised up the low estate of our nature by His taking the place of Firstborn among us, and hast made us heirs of the good things to come which have no end. And when that time was come, for which we looked, for the adoption of sons, unto the redemption of our bodies, Thou gavest us the pledge of consolation, the grace of the Holy Ghost, which is received from the holy sacraments of

[1] Asseman's text contains a word *corruptionis* in this sentence, which appears impossible to translate. It does not appear in Badger.

spiritual Baptism : even as these Thy servants and handmaidens have drawn near to-day and have put on that gift, whereby being loosed from sinful affections they have been made pure members in the body of Christ who is our Head. And we look that Thy grace may keep them in chastity of life and purity of works, that being full of faith and righteousness they may meet the reverend appearing of our Saviour Christ, and may enjoy the new and indissoluble life, and may raise to Thee glory and honour and thanksgiving and adoration, now and ever and world without end.

"And he signs each one of them upon the forehead with his right thumb, from beneath upwards, and from the right to the left, saying :—

"N. is baptized and perfected in the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Ghost."

The priest adds :—

"The pledge of the Holy Ghost which thou hast received ; the sacrament of Christ which thou hast taken ; the new life which thou hast possessed ; the armour of righteousness which thou hast put on ; preserve thee from the evil one and his powers, and sanctify thy members with purity ; and may that seal which thou hast received be to thee for good things to come which pass not away, at the revelation of our Lord Jesus Christ, and may He in His new world place thee at His right hand, and mayest thou raise glory and thanksgiving to the Father and to the Son and to the Holy Ghost now and ever and world without end. Amen."

IV. The Jacobite Churches.

Asseman gives a considerable number of Syriac baptismal offices, belonging to the Jacobite communities of Antioch, Jerusalem, and elsewhere ; but the differences between them are not very great. It can hardly be doubted by

those who read them carefully through, that the same confusing tendency which has made these Oriental bodies to take a Monophysite view of the Incarnation, has been at work upon their doctrine of the baptismal gifts. In this way it comes about that the rite which ought to be considered most truly to represent the apostolic Laying on of Hands is performed before Baptism, not after it, and is, apparently, supposed to form one effect with it.

In the prayers which look forward to the future initiation of a young child, sometimes Confirmation seems to merge in Baptism, and sometimes Baptism in Confirmation. Thus :

"Make this Thy servant meet, we beseech Thee, that by the help of Thy boundless power he may come to the Baptism of incorruption, and by the communion of Thy Body and Blood may be made a partner of Thine elect."

Or, as it is elsewhere, at one of the preliminary impositions of the hand :—

"Stretch forth the right hand of Thy divine Majesty along with the feeble right hand of the priest Thy servant, and bless this infant, that by Thy hidden power he may be signed with the reverend seal of Thy most holy Cross [which is just about to be set upon him] ; and let Thy grace accompany him all the days of his life that he may come to Thy holy temple and to the venerable seal of the pure Chrism and of the sweet odour, through which, by the operation of the Holy Ghost, we are made sons of God and heirs of Thy kingdom."

Immediately after the latter prayer comes the benediction and ministration of the oil of the catechumenate, which appears to take to itself something of that which rightly belongs to the greater Unction :—

"Our Father which art in heaven, Lord of the world, in Thy name and in the name of Thy Christ and in the name of Thy Holy Ghost, we sign this oil, that Thy virtue may

endue it, and the help of Thy Divinity be mingled with it, that whosoever shall be permitted to be anointed with it, may put on the armour of the Spirit upon his members, and prevail to resist the devil and his powers."

In the form which seems from Asseman's account to be the chief and most usual form, one of the initial prayers contains the request—

"That they may be made worthy of the regeneration from above by water and the Spirit: moreover (*ad hoc*) that they may be sheep of the true Shepherd, sealed with the Seal of Thy Holy Spirit, and honourable members in the body of Thy holy Church."

Another :—

"Thou who hast given a blessed purification in the healthful waters, and divine sanctification in the holy anointing, and union with our Lord Jesus Christ through the partaking of His sacred Body and Blood."

The next prayer is less exact :—

"Give them, O Lord, that holy breathing of Thine, which Thy only begotten Son breathed upon His disciples, and drive far from their minds all remains of idolatry,[1] preparing them for the reception of Thy Holy Spirit, that they may be made worthy of the washing of regeneration."

Here the receiving of the Spirit is a preparation for the new birth.

After the Catechism, or renunciations and professions, the priest prays :—

"Be pleased, O Lord, to send upon them Thy Holy Spirit, and come down and search out all their members, and forecleanse and sanctify them, that they may be made worthy of the holy Unction and of perfect faith through Christ Jesus our Lord."

Here, on the other hand, Baptism seems to be lost in the Chrism.

[1] A reference, no doubt, to exorcism by "exsufflation."

Immediately after this last prayer follows that Imposition of Hands, which, from the prayer accompanying it, ought, as I have said, to be considered as most truly representing the Apostolic rite, only unfortunately misplaced :

"O Holy Father, who by the hands of Thy holy Apostles didst give the Holy Spirit to those who were baptized, now also, using the shadow of my hands, send Thy Holy Spirit upon those who are to be baptized, that being filled with Him and with His divine gifts, they may yield to Thee fruit thirtyfold, sixtyfold, and a hundredfold. From Thee is every good bestowal and every perfect gift; and to Thee we raise glory, and to Thy only begotten Son, and to the Holy Ghost.

"The priest dips his thumb in the olive oil and signs them on their foreheads with three crosses, saying after this fashion :

"N. is signed with the oil of gladness against every operation of the adversary, and that he may be grafted into the good olive, in the holy Catholic and Apostolic Church, in the name of the Father, Amen, and of the Son, Amen, and of the Holy Ghost, Amen, unto the life of the world eternal, Amen."

As a matter of fact all that has thus far been done has been the making of a catechumen, although the language seems to imply more. But the service proceeds without a break to Baptism and the Seal. Amongst other prayers, the priest prays :—

"Give virtue to the waters of Baptism, O Thou who through the Passion of Thy Christ dost grant remission from every sin, unto abundant reception of Thy Holy Spirit."

This appears to teach that the Spirit is received in Baptism itself,—though it need not necessarily mean that it is more than a preparation for the same. The prayer of consecration of the font which follows soon after does

not include this gift in its enumeration of blessings asked:—

"Make these waters waters of comfort, waters of gladness and rejoicing, waters mystically designed by the Death and Resurrection of Thy only begotten Son, waters of expiation, the cleansing of impurity of flesh and spirit, the loosing of bonds, the remission of falls, the illumination of souls, the washing of regeneration, the gift of adoption of sons, the garment of incorruption, the renewal of Thy Holy Spirit, waters that wash away every stain of soul and body."

But then, after a fine invocation of the Holy Ghost upon the water, follows:—

"O Thou who didst send Thy Holy Ghost in the form of a dove upon Thy only begotten Son, who is God and Word, who fulfilled upon earth the discipline of baptism; and didst sanctify the streams of Jordan; may it please Thee now, O Lord, that that Holy Ghost of Thine may abide upon these Thy servants now being baptized, and do Thou perfect them and make them of the household of Thy Christ, purging them by Thy sacred laver."

Again another unction is performed, this time over the whole body, and the person is placed in the font, while these and other songs are sung:—

"With holy oil God commanded that Aaron should be anointed and then sanctified. With holy oil the simple sheep are anointed who are come to Baptism.

"The priest doth stand beside the font, and call upon the Holy Ghost who descendeth from on high. The Holy Ghost falleth and descendeth and dwelleth in the waters and sanctifieth them."

Then comes the actual Baptism, followed by the Psalm, "Blessed are they whose iniquities are forgiven"; and the priest proceeds immediately to the "Seal of the Chrism":—

"This Seal also let these Thy servants receive, who

through the faith of their Baptism have been enrolled among Thy soldiers; that they, being filled through this Chrism with every odour of spiritual sweetness, may not be overtaken by powers of the enemy, fearing nothing from the principalities and powers of darkness, but walking in the light may be the sons of light, and so may proceed in Thee, and arrive at Thee. For Thou art the true light, and in Thy light we see light, and Thine is the glory now and ever and world without end."

This prayer no doubt has reference to the common title of Baptism—Enlightenment.

"Then he turns to the baptized, and signs them with the sacred Chrism upon their foreheads, and upon their throats, thrice saying,

"With the holy Chrism, with the sweetness of the savour of Christ, with the seal of the true faith, with the completion of the gift of the Holy Ghost, N. is sealed in the name of the Father," etc.

"And bowing down he prays,

"Blessed art Thou, O Lord Almighty, fountain of life and of good things, Father of true light, who by the arising of Thy only begotten Son our Lord Jesus Christ hast enlightened them that are on earth as well as them that are in heaven; who hast given a blessed purification in healthful Baptism, and divine sanctification in the holy Anointing and union with Thy Christ through Thy quickening Spirit; who now also hast been pleased through our ministry to regenerate Thy servants by water and the Spirit unto hope of eternal life, and hast bestowed on them remission of the sins which, whether willingly or unwillingly, they had before contracted, and hast translated them into Thy dominion; Send forth upon them, O Lord, the grace of Thy Holy and quickening Spirit, and fill them with His sanctification.

"And he raises his voice;—

"Keep them in the acknowledgment of Thyself; confirm them in the faith; preserve them in Thy fear; stablish in their souls the way of Thy quickening commandments; make them sons of light; and that they may live without blame under the rule of Thy Christ, make them worthy, for Thou art the God of salvation, and to Thee we raise glory, with Thy only begotten Son and Thy Holy Spirit, now and ever and world without end."

The other forms only differ from this in minute points.

SECTION III.

THE GIFT OF THE HOLY GHOST.

Unless I have signally failed in the setting forth of the Scriptural and Patristic texts, two points will by this time be, I believe, abundantly clear; first, that if we are to be guided by primitive antiquity, Confirmation is an integral part of Holy Baptism,[1] in such a sense that what we usually call Baptism is, without it, an unfinished fragment, although conveying priceless blessings; and secondly, that the *res sacramenti*, the objective bounty extended by God for our acceptance, in this crowning part of Baptism, is that which bears the title of the gift of the Holy Ghost. In so special and unique a sense does this gift belong to Confirmation, that, notwithstanding all previous operations of the Holy Ghost upon the soul, the baptized but unconfirmed believer may, unless the Divine action departs from its ordinary course, be truly said not to have received the Holy Ghost.

It must be allowed that such language has the appearance of being startling and unusual to those

[1] An interesting trace of this doctrine is to be found in the ordinary Welsh name for Confirmation, which means "the Bishop's Baptism."

who have grown up under the shadow of the modern traditions of the official theology of the West. The reader will not have forgotten a certain homily of the fifth century in which Faustus gave us a vigorous description of what Confirmation has to add to the blessings of Christian Baptism.[1] That homily has had an effect far wider and far other than the preacher ever dreamed that it would have. The utterances of the half Pelagian (whose name was lost) were worked up by the forger or forgers of the Decretals, into a letter purporting to issue from the pen of Melchiades, Bishop of Rome at the time of Constantine's conversion. The letter of the so-called Melchiades served S. Thomas Aquinas as the authority with which to bar, in his *Summa*, those who denied that Confirmation was a sacrament, and that it conferred the "grace which makes us acceptable."[2] From the authority given by S. Thomas's use of it, the letter had supreme weight in the deliberations of the Council of Trent, and is more quoted than any other ancient document in that section of the Tridentine Catechism which treats of Confirmation. It thus came to set the standard of doctrine on the subject to Latin Christianity, and extended its influence over many who, though not bound by the Tridentine decisions, yet pay deference to them. Now, among many other clearer expressions used by Faustus of Riez in his Pentecostal homily, occurs one which describes the benefit of Confirmation as an *augmen-*

[1] See above p. 192.

[2] *Summ. Theol.* part iii. vol. ii quaest. lxxii art. 1, 7. See also art. 8.

tum ad gratiam—a development, or additional gift thrown, as it were, into the bargain, for advancement in grace. This word *augmentum* worked with what might almost be called fatal effect upon those who read it as coming from Melchiades. It lent itself to a sense not intended by the Gallican homilist. As Baptism was the sacrament of birth, so Confirmation was now to be the sacrament of growth. By it, the soul new born in Baptism, was to rise at once from infancy into maturity of manhood. This is the view which chiefly commends itself to Aquinas.[1] The natural life suggests, as he says, analogies for the spiritual life :—

"Now it is plain that in the bodily life there is a special perfecting, by which the man comes to perfect age, and is able to do the perfect actions of a man; whence also the Apostle says, 'When I became a man, I put away childish things.' Thence it comes also that besides the movement of generation, whereby a

[1] Aquinas already, in treating of Baptism, had spoken—though in passing only—of that initial sacrament as conveying "the grace of the Holy Ghost and abundance of virtues." (Part iii. vol. ii. quaest. lxix. art. 2.) The words are not his own, but those of the Gloss upon Tit. iii. 5, 6,—in which passage S. Paul was no doubt thinking of Baptism as including Confirmation, not as contrasted with it. S. Thomas does not speak of any impartition or indwelling of the Holy Ghost when he enumerates formally the benefits of Baptism; he only speaks of Baptism as taking away sin and its guilt, incorporating us into Christ and making us partakers of His fulness. But to quote the whole of Tit. iii. 5, 6, of Baptism pure and simple seems to attribute to it a grace which required a fuller exposition. The Tridentine Catechism went further still, and said that the grace of Baptism is spoken of in Scripture as being "shed abroad" and having as one of its ordinary appellations the title of "the earnest of the Holy Spirit." (*De Bapt. Sacr.* § 41. Compare *Conc. Trid.* sess. vi. 7.)

person receives the bodily life, there is the movement of growth (*augmenti*), whereby a person is brought to perfect age. In like manner, therefore, the man receives the spiritual life by Baptism, which is the spiritual regeneration; but in Confirmation the man receives, so to speak, a kind of perfect age of the spiritual life."[1]

To support this conclusion "Melchiades" is introduced, though assuredly "Melchiades" did not mean by his *augmentum* the growth of the soul, but an addition to a former grace. So again, in the next "article," Aquinas repeats that "in this sacrament is given the fulness of the Holy Ghost for spiritual strength, which belongs to perfect age." And a little later:—

"It has already been said that as Baptism is a kind of regeneration into the Christian life, so also Confirmation is a kind of spiritual growth, advancing the man into perfect spiritual age. Now it is manifest from the analogy of the bodily life that the action of a human being newly born is one thing, and the action which belongs to him on arriving at perfect age is another. And therefore by the sacrament of Confirmation is given to the man the spiritual power to do certain sacred actions over and above those which he was empowered to do in Baptism. For in Baptism the man receives power to do those things which pertain to his own salvation, as living a life of his own; but in Confirmation the man receives power to do those things which pertain to the spiritual

[1] *l.c.* quaest. lxxii. art. 1.

combat against the foes of the faith; as appears from the example of the Apostles, who before they received the fulness of the Holy Ghost were in the upper chamber, continuing in prayer, but afterwards went forth and were not afraid publicly to confess their belief, even before the enemies of the Christian faith."[1]

So writes Aquinas, mingling the worse and the better. The Tridentine divines, not extracting the better from the worse, failed to make the cause which they had undertaken seem more reasonable to its impugners, when they affirmed that "the difference which there is in the natural life between generation and growth (*incremento*) is the same as that between Baptism, which has the effect of regenerating, and Confirmation, by virtue of which the faithful develope (*augescunt*), and attain perfect strength of soul. Besides, inasmuch as a new and distinct kind of sacrament ought to be appointed when the soul incurs a new difficulty, it can easily be seen that, as we need the grace of Baptism for the formation of the mind by faith, so it is exceedingly profitable that souls should be confirmed by another grace, in order that they may not be deterred from the confession of the true faith by any danger or dread of pains or penalties or death."[2]

Although these doctors retain side by side with such sentences much of the orthodox language of earlier days, by which the feeblenesses of their own can be

[1] *l.c.* art. 5; compare also art. 8, 10.
[2] Cat. Trid. *de Sacr. Confirm* § 4. Compare § 16.

corrected, yet it is plain that a vast change of feeling has taken place between their days and the days when Baptism and Confirmation were at once more closely associated and more clearly distinguished from each other. And the same process has continued in the Roman Communion, since the time of Trent. Although the language of the *Pontificale*, in the administration of Confirmation, is still the language of Sirice and Ambrose, and occasionally finds a clear and manly echo in the utterances of teachers in communion with Rome, yet Confirmation on the whole has come to hold but a small and diminishing place in the general system of professional doctrine. Growth, and the force and courage of full age, are the chief topics insisted upon in this connexion.[1]

[1] The book which is most relied upon and most recommended at the present time by the leading section of the Roman Communion—Hurter's *Theologiae Dogmaticae Compendium*—devotes but four pages and six lines to the subject of Confirmation, as against a hundred and nineteen pages upon the Eucharist and ninety-three upon Penance. These four pages are taken up with technical discussions concerning the claim of Confirmation to be called a sacrament, and concerning the minister and the matter of it. Although in the course of these discussions there are incidental signs of a warmer and more primitive faith behind, the only actual statement of the benefit of Confirmation lies in the definition, said to be the usual one—*Definiri solet confirmatio sacramentum N.L., quo baptizatis gratia sanctificans augetur et additur robur sancti Spiritus tum ad firmiter credendum, tum ad fidem ipsam strenue profitendam.* There is no examination of the directly dogmatic question, What is it that we may hope to receive in Confirmation? It may be added that there is a similar poverty in Hurter's treatment of Holy Baptism. Hurter only expressly speaks of its proper effect as "regeneration, the beginning of the (habitual) supernatural life"; this regeneration is not further explained; nothing is directly said even of the remission of sins in it; and though the author does not in so many words assert that the gift, or any gift, of the Holy Ghost is given in Baptism, he quotes S. Peter's words in Acts

It does not require great acumen, however, to point out that those analogies of nature, to which S. Thomas appeals, by no means serve to enforce this modern view of the relationship between the two baptismal sacraments. Growth, in the natural world, is not the result of anything new and adventitious, except what comes in the way of support. The life begun in birth naturally asserts itself in growth, if only it be sustained with proper food. No third movement, distinct from generation on the one hand, and from nutrition on the other, needs to be imparted at a given moment in order to produce growth. And certainly there is no movement known, by which the immature life can be made to pass forthwith into maturity, from the weakness of infancy into the strength of accomplished manhood. Such a passage is the slow work of time. The Roman view of Confirmation as a sacrament of growth does not suit the symbolism of a sacrament given once and once for all. If Confirmation were a sacrament given daily or at frequent intervals, beginning with the Baptism of the infant, and ceasing when the infant might be said to have attained its full spiritual stature, then Confirmation might be considered the sacrament of growth, but not Confirmation as we understand it, administered without repetition, and imprinting upon the soul a "character" which can never be effaced. The Holy Eucharist is the sacra-

ii. 38 as applying to that sacrament without referring to Confirmation. Theological manuals ought not to be so thin and meagre upon matters of spiritual well-being as this.

ment which answers to the nutriment by which the spiritual life is sustained and developed, as Holy Baptism is that which first initiates the life; and there seems to be no room in the analogy for another sacrament which is to have the effect of imparting growth, —least of all for one imparting a sudden growth from a state of imperfection into one of perfection.

And indeed this theory, framed to support the practice of infant Baptism followed by adult Confirmation, ignores the conditions in which the two sacraments were all but universally administered in ancient days, and still are administered throughout a very great part of Christendom. When men—or infants—were, and are, confirmed immediately after Baptism,—and this may be said to be the normal method of administration,—there is no period of spiritual infancy, to be crowned (as the theory demands) with a transition to maturity; the maturity comes simultaneously with birth. The foes, which according to S. Thomas await the growing up of the spiritual life, and need to be conquered by means of a new sacrament, beset the man who is grown up in the natural sense, even though in the spiritual sense he may be yet an infant and kept waiting for the perfecting sacrament; they do not yet assail, as afterwards they will assail, the young child who has received Confirmation on the same day as his Baptism. The whole treatment of the subject by later Roman hands is an instance of the way in which the figurative, sometimes half-playful nomenclature of the early Church has been stiffened into cumbrous dogma.

In this respect, as in so many others, the Greek Church, though greatly influenced by Western teaching, has been more faithful to primitive tradition, and sets forth a richer gospel of the sacraments. The Russian bishop, Macarius, cannot, indeed, shake off the conception of growth which has trammelled Latin divines in treating of the subject; but it will be felt that he gives an entirely different turn to the conception, when he speaks of Confirmation as a sacrament which will enable the baptized infant to grow up gradually into spiritual maturity, instead of considering it, as the Latins do, as an act of transition by which the child, now advanced beyond childhood, passes into maturity at a bound.

"By Baptism," he says, "we are born to the spiritual life, and, pure from all sin, justified, sanctified, we enter into the kingdom of grace of our Lord Jesus Christ. But just as, in the natural life, the man, but newly come into the world, has need of air, of light, of forces and succours, to support his existence, to strengthen and develope himself by degrees, so also in the spiritual life, as soon as he is born from above, he cannot do without the forces and grace of the Holy Spirit: they are his spiritual air and light; he has need of them not only to maintain his new life, but also to confirm and develope himself in it more and more. Whosoever, therefore, has been regenerated in Baptism, is likewise granted that same 'divine power pertaining unto life and godliness' (2 Pet. i. 3) by another sacrament, the Unction of the Chrism. Accordingly the Orthodox Church retains her ancient

custom of administering this latter sacrament immediately after and even in conjunction with the former." "The Christian," he adds, "receives from the Divine grace the forces necessary to strengthen himself and to grow in the spiritual life." [1]

The whole section of his work in which this acute and learned theologian sets forth the Oriental doctrine of Confirmation is full of interest and spiritual beauty, although there are occasional statements in which it is not possible to follow him. It presents a marked contrast to the jejune technicalities of some Western dogmatic works upon the subject.[2]

Macarius begins with recalling the Lord's great invitation to all the thirsty to come and drink of that Water proceeding from Himself, which should in turn proceed from them to others (S. John vii. 37–39). "It is evident," he says, "that we are here concerned with those gifts of the Holy Ghost which are offered—and consequently are generally necessary—to all those who believe in Jesus Christ, and not with those extraordinary gifts which are only communicated to certain ones among them for certain specific purposes; although there is here no indication of the visible means by which these indispensable gifts of the Holy Ghost are to be bestowed upon all believers." He then proceeds to point out how, as a fact, when our Lord was glorified, the Apostles actually bestowed the Holy Spirit, by the Laying on of Hands. The narra-

[1] *Théologie Dogmatique Orthodoxe* vol. iii. p. 410.

[2] It occupies twenty-six pages, as compared with seventy on the Holy Eucharist, and forty-eight on Penance.

tive of the Confirmation at Samaria, he says, makes it plain, among other things, that "the Apostles communicated the Holy Ghost to the believers, not by Baptism (in which the latter are born again or created anew by the Spirit for the moment only,[1] and do not receive Him in themselves for ever), but by the Imposition of Hands upon those who had already received Baptism."

"The principal invisible effect of the sacrament of Unction," says Macarius, "is to impart to the faithful the Holy Ghost. In Baptism we are only purified and regenerated by the virtue of the Holy Spirit, but we are not yet fit to receive that Spirit in ourselves and to become His temples. By the Unction, He is imparted to us with all the gifts of His grace, which are indispensable for the spiritual life . . . The gifts of the Holy Ghost imparted to believers by the sacrament of Unction being seven in number (Is. xi. 2, 3), . . . and three of them serving chiefly to enlighten the understanding, and the other four to inform and fortify the will in that which is good, it is said particularly (1) that the sacrament of Unction communicates to us the grace of the Spirit which enlightens us and makes us intelligent in the truths of faith . . . (2) that it communicates to us the grace of the Spirit which fortifies us and makes us grow in godliness."

He adds that occasionally the Apostles bestowed

[1] By this strange expression he seems to mean that the visitation of the Spirit at regeneration is but a quickening touch, by which the new life is set up, not the beginning of a permanent indwelling.

also in this sacrament extraordinary gifts of the Holy Ghost, but that these were "extraordinary effects of the sacrament, to meet the needs of the primitive Church, not the normal effects, inherent in the very nature of the sacrament." Even in those days not all received the extraordinary gifts; whereas Confirmation "was regarded as indispensable for all those who had received Baptism, in order that they might be able to receive the Holy Ghost."[1]

This doctrine of the Eastern Church agrees well with that which we may gather to be the authoritative teaching of the reformed Church of England. No formal definition of what we are to expect in Confirmation is set before us in our Catechism or Articles; but we may bless the providence of God which, in days when Confirmation was being

[1] The official doctrine (so far as it can be said that there is any such) of the Greek Church thus defines the benefits of Confirmation :—

"These are the fruits of this mystery. First, that as by Baptism we are regenerated, so by the holy Unction we are made partakers of the Holy Ghost, being confirmed in the faith of the Lord, and grow in Divine grace, according to the saying of the Apostle, 'He saved us according to His mercy by the washing of regeneration and renewing of the Holy Ghost, which He poured out upon us richly through Jesus Christ our Saviour.' Secondly, that by the power of the Holy Ghost we are made so firm and strong that our ghostly enemy can in no wise injure our souls" (*ἀπὸ τὸ μυστήριον τοῦτο γενοῦνται οἱ καρποὶ τοῦτοι· πρῶτον διατὶ καθὼς μὲ τὸ βάπτισμα ἀναγεννώμεθα, τέτοιας λογῆς μὲ τὸ ἅγιον μύρον γενόμεθα μέτοχοι τοῦ ἁγίου πνεύματος, βεβαιωθέντες εἰς τὴν πίστιν τοῦ κυρίου, καὶ αὐξάνομεν εἰς τὴν θείαν χάριν κατὰ τὸν ἀπόστολον· . . . δεύτερον διατὶ μὲ τὴν δύναμιν τοῦ ἁγίου πνεύματος οὕτως εἴμεσθεν βέβαιοι καὶ στερεοὶ ὅπου δὲν ἠμπορεῖ νὰ βλάψῃ καθόλου ὁ νοητὸς ἐχθρὸς τὴν ψυχήν μας*). *Confess. Orthod.* part i. quaest. cv. (Kimmel *Monumenta Fidei Eccl. Orientalis* p. 177). This confession was drawn up by Peter Mogilas, Metropolitan of Kiew, and was accepted by all the Eastern Patriarchs in the year 1643.

treated by powerful reformers abroad as no more than the voluntary ratification of a covenant made in infancy, and when many even in England were learning to employ similar language, retained for us the fulness of the primitive Prayer before the Laying on of Hands, and saved us from any expression elsewhere that would have been at all out of harmony with that prayer.[1]

[1] The expression in Article XXV., "Confirmation, Penance, etc., are not to be counted for Sacraments of the Gospel, being such as have grown partly of the corrupt following of the Apostles, partly are states of life allowed in the Scriptures," has been differently interpreted. Some suppose that Confirmation (as is perhaps the case with Orders) is classed as a "state of life allowed (*i.e.* approved) in the Scriptures:" others suppose that the "partly . . . partly" is not intended to be an exhaustive division of the "five commonly called Sacraments." My own belief is that "Confirmation," which heads the list of the five, is (together with the closely connected "extreme Unction") intended to be described by the other category, as having "grown of the corrupt following of the Apostles." "Confirmation" in the official language of the time meant distinctly the rite of Unction, after a certain form, with a chrism elaborately compounded. Thus in the bull of Eugenius IV. (Council of Florence A. D. 1439) for the guidance of the Armenians who accepted the yoke of Rome,—a bull which, in spite of the dubious position of Eugenius at the time of writing it, ranks with the letter of the spurious Melchiades in its powerful influence upon the history of the doctrine of this sacrament,—after the description of the matter, "a chrism compounded of oil, which signifies the clearness of the conscience, and of balsam, which signifies the odour of a good report, blessed by the bishop,"—and after the action of the Apostles at Samaria has been recited in proof of the position that only bishops can confirm,—we next read, "*In the stead of* that Laying on of the Hand Confirmation is now given in the Church" (*loco autem illius manus impositionis datur in ecclesia confirmatio*). So, at an earlier period, Alexander of Hales (p. iv. q. xxiv. m. 1) spoke of the Apostles as "confirming without a sacrament," and said that the sacrament was instituted at the instance of the Holy Ghost in "the Council of Meaux" as far as form and matter were concerned. That no such Council was ever held does not concern us. Before either Eugenius or Alexander, Alanus de Insulis, known as the "Universal Doctor,"

In the first place we have been preserved from any expression which would have robbed Confirmation of its glory by attributing to the initial part of Baptism that which Holy Scripture and the Fathers attribute to the second. No word in the baptismal offices can be taken to imply that the Holy Ghost is "given" in that part of the sacrament. One phrase, which appears to approach to such a statement, is found on examination to guard most carefully against the error of the later Roman theology, and by its explicit terms is a witness for the older doctrine. "Give Thy Holy Spirit to this infant," so the Church prays immediately before the christening of the child, but adds at once, "that he may be born again, and be made an heir of everlasting salvation." The nature and extent of the gift to be expected at the font is defined and restricted. It is such a gift or impartition as regenerates, not that which takes up its abode in the regenerate. By other expressions in the baptismal offices we are taught to expect that the baptized will be "born anew of Water and of the

wrote as follows:—"That virtue which was given by the Apostles by means of the Laying on of Hands, is given to the faithful by means of Confirmation . . . Therefore since the heretics themselves esteem the Laying on of Hands to be a great sacrament, the place of which is now taken by this sacrament of Confirmation (*cuius uicem retinet hoc sacramentum confirmationis*), they do wrong to detract from this sacrament" (*Contr. Haeret.* lib. i. cap. 66). It was against Confirmation in this sense, and only this, that the scurrilities of men like Becon and Calfhill were directed. "Confirmation," in the sense of a *substitute* for the apostolic rite, was discarded by the Holy English Church, in returning to a more primitive practice. That nothing in the least derogatory to the dignity of "Confirmation" (in the truer sense) was intended, is plain from the office for Confirmation itself.

Holy Ghost," "baptized with Water and the Holy Ghost,[1]" "washed and sanctified with the Holy Ghost," "receive the fulness of God's grace;" but never that he will receive that special "promise" of the Holy Ghost for which S. Peter on the day of Pentecost said that repentance and Baptism would qualify his hearers, or that "abundant outpouring" of which S. Paul spoke to Titus. These promises and outpourings are reserved for the moment when those whom God has already "vouchsafed to regenerate by Water and the Holy Ghost," come to the bishop to be, through his prayer and the Laying on

[1] It is indeed questionable whether this particular phrase is a quite satisfactory one to use in relation to the initial act of regeneration. The exact words are not found in Holy Scripture at all, though they no doubt put together very truly the thoughts which underlie more than one Scriptural text. To be "baptized with (ἐν) Holy Ghost" occurs (always in contrast with John's baptism) in S. Mark i. 8, S. John i. 33, Acts i. 5 and xi. 16; to be "baptized with (ἐν) Holy Ghost and fire" occurs in S. Luke iii. 16 and (probably) S. Matt. iii. 11. It will, I believe, be felt that these passages, when read in the connexion in which they are placed by Acts i. 5 and xi. 16, refer rather to the Pentecostal outpouring than to the first regenerating movement of the Spirit, and that therefore writers like the author of the *De Rebaptismate* (see p. 125 foll.) are correct who understand this "Baptism with Holy Ghost (and fire)" to be conveyed to us in Confirmation, not in Baptism proper. But the prefixing of the words "with water," which do not come in Scripture in this context, modify the force of the subsequent "and the Holy Ghost"; and no one could deny that the expression "to be baptized with water and the Holy Ghost," by itself, without regard to the meaning of the Scripture passages, would very fitly describe the action through which we are first brought by the Spirit of God into the new life of forgiveness and participation in the Divine nature. The composers of our office may have made a mistake in *exegesis*, if they understood the "baptism with the Holy Ghost" to refer to what we commonly call Baptism; but there is no proof that they made a mistake of *doctrine*, as they would have done if they had meant that in Baptism we receive that which in the Bible is called the gift of the Holy Ghost.

of his hands, "strengthened" with the sevenfold Spirit.[1]

And we have lost nothing of the ancient faith in Confirmation itself. It is true that there are, in the office for Confirmation, effects and traces of the tendency of mediæval theology to minimise that sacrament. The point and purpose of the sacrament is not so vividly expressed in the prayer which (in my belief) constitutes our "form" of Confirmation, as in the primitive invocation upon which it is based. "*Strengthen* them, O Lord, with the Holy Ghost the Comforter, and daily *increase* in them Thy manifold gifts of grace," is perhaps a less clear echo of Holy Scripture and the ancient Fathers than the Gelasian, "*Send upon them* Thy Holy Ghost the Comforter, and *give* them the Spirit of wisdom and understanding,"

[1] It is instructive to observe the prayer that the Holy Ghost may be given *after* Baptism, in the public reception of one privately baptized, and in the office for the Baptism of those of Riper Years. "Give Thy Holy Spirit to this infant (these persons) that he, being born again, (being now born again) and being made an heir of everlasting salvation . . . may continue Thy servant and attain Thy promises." This shews that the baptized person is not yet supposed to have received the Holy Spirit in that sense in which the reception imprints a "character." I am ready to acknowledge that the exhortation in the office for Baptism of those of Riper Years apparently implies that the reception of the Holy Ghost, promised by S. Peter, is granted in Baptism itself; this is indicated not only by the quotation of his words, but also by the charge to believe that God (or Christ) "will grant them the remission of their sins, and bestow upon them the Holy Ghost." But even if this be so, the nature and extent of the gift is defined, as in the Baptism of Infants, by the following prayer. It is, therefore, an exegetical mistake again, not a doctrinal one. The compilers perhaps mistook what S. Peter meant and thought that he spoke of that gift by which we are born again; they did not suppose that the gift in the full apostolic sense of the word was to be given then and there.

or the present Roman, "*Send forth* upon them Thy holy sevenfold Spirit the Comforter from heaven." By bringing at once into sight the beneficial consequences of the gift—the strength and continuous progress to come—our office seems in some degree to distract the eye from the adorable gift itself, and makes it possible for the prayer to be used by men who do not believe that a new relation is then beginning between the soul and the promised Comforter. Such a softening and accommodation on the part of the Church is noticeable elsewhere also; as when, at the administration of the Blessed Eucharist, the priest no longer says simply, "The Body of the Lord," awakening faith to discern what it receives, but, "The Body of our Lord Jesus Christ, which was given for thee, preserve thy body and soul unto everlasting life," drawing attention to the benefits to be expected from reception. But in either case, most surely the benefits to be expected imply the reality of the gift which brings them; and the words, coupled with the sacramental act, are a distinct assertion that it is here and now and by this means that the gift is conveyed. "Strengthen them with the Holy Ghost the Comforter" might be prayed at any time over Christians, especially *after* their Confirmation; still more the prayer, "Daily increase in them Thy manifold gifts of grace;" but it cannot be taken to imply that the persons prayed for are already possessed of that Holy Spirit and only need to be more powerfully affected by the possession. This might, perhaps, be understood to be the case, if the expressions stood by

themselves in the course of some daily office; it is impossible when they occur in connexion with the solemn rite derived from apostolic practice, and when the foregoing words set in contrast what has already been received with what is still expected:—"Almighty and everlasting God, who hast vouchsafed to regenerate these Thy servants by Water and the Holy Ghost, and hast given unto them forgiveness of all their sins; strengthen them, we beseech Thee, O Lord, with the Holy Ghost the Comforter." It is a new gift, not received before, of which the effect will be to strengthen the faithful recipients, and to begin a life of new relationship between the Holy Spirit and them, so that each successive day in the future may bring out new developments of the Holy Spirit's power, in ever advancing ratio.[1]

It remains to endeavour reverently to discover what is the spiritual significance and practical value of the new relationship set up between the believer and the Holy Spirit in Baptism by means of that Laying on of Hands which is the completion of the sacrament.

[1] It is surely a mistake to do what is now done in some English dioceses, to interpose the *Veni Creator Spiritus*, or other hymn,—sometimes I believe that even an address is interposed,—between this prayer and the Imposition of Hands. The prayer answers to that sacramental prayer by which the Apostles at Samaria drew down the gift upon the baptized (Acts viii. 15); and the Imposition of Hands is the application to each believer of the gift which has thus been drawn down; it ought therefore, surely, to follow without a break. The words which actually accompany the Imposition of Hands—"Defend, O Lord," etc.—are only words of benediction in the moment of delivery; they may be generalised and said once over many persons, or might be omitted altogether, without vitiating the sacrament. The prayer for the sevenfold Spirit ought to be said by the bishop with his face towards the candidates, not towards the altar.

The distinction between the work of the Holy Spirit upon the soul before and after the Laying on of Hands appears to be that which is touched upon by our Lord, when He says to His Apostles, according to the usually received text, "The world cannot receive [the Spirit of truth], because it beholdeth Him not, neither knoweth Him; ye know Him, because He abideth with you, and He shall be in you" (S. John xiv. 17). As the words stand, they contain a promise, which was fulfilled at Pentecost. The Holy Ghost which was already "with" the Apostles, then came to be "in" them. There is, however, a doubt about the text. Westcott and Hort, though with hesitation, adopt the reading, "and is in you." Apart from the purely critical grounds on which their verdict is based, the present tense appears to be the most natural, inasmuch as our Lord is giving a reason for the assertion that the Apostles already "know" the Spirit, and therefore will be able to receive Him when He comes. It is no reason, to say, "Ye know Him, because . . . He shall be in you." If the future be the correct text, then we must, with Godet, punctuate otherwise and read, "Ye know Him, because He dwelleth with you; and (ye shall know Him better, for) He shall be in you." But in view of the doubtfulness of the reading we cannot with certainty say that the passage contrasts the then present relationship between the disciples and the Spirit, with that which was afterwards to be established. In a sense the Spirit was already "in" them, as He had been "in" the prophets of the Old Testament (1 Pet. i. 11), and

"within" and "amidst" the people of Israel (Is. lxiii. 11, בְּקִרְבּוֹ; Hagg. ii. 5, בְּתוֹכְכֶם). But none the less, the words of Christ are no rhetorical pleonasm. They represent two distinct relationships between the Spirit and the disciples, both of which were already partially bestowed upon them, and both of which were afterwards to be transfigured, and intensified, and consummated. To "abide with" them was one thing; to "be in" them was another. As Dr. Godet says, in his comment upon the passage, "The confusion between two states so different from each other has entailed consequences beyond calculation."

I cannot think that either Dr. Godet, or Dr. Westcott, in their commentaries on the passage, express all that is meant by the words "abideth with you," when they point to the fact that the disciples were in enjoyment of the companionship of Christ, in whom the Holy Spirit dwelt and through whom He dealt with them. I think that even the abiding of the Holy Spirit with the disciples involved direct action of His upon them. No doubt the most marked and perceptible way in which He was acting upon them was through the teaching and example of Christ; but I cannot think that the words "He abideth with you" have reference only to this local nearness of theirs to One in whom He dwelt. They were not only in the neighbourhood of grace. The abiding with them implies an immediate pressure, steadily and continuously brought to bear upon mind and heart and conscience and will, by which the Holy Spirit was winning them more and more to believe in

the Christ whose life they witnessed and to whose words they listened. The Holy Ghost, even then, was not, to them, an occasional visitant, leaving them at times to their own unaided efforts and withdrawing from His interest in them. He was ever at the side of each of them; ever at hand to them also as a body of men; and they had felt that it was so, even if they could not yet have put their experience into words. When He should come, they would be able to recognise His presence and influence in those earlier experiences of theirs. But this abiding with them was not all that they even then enjoyed—according to the reading which I accept;—still less was it all that they were to enjoy at a later time. The Holy Ghost "was in" them. It was, perhaps, because of His being in them that they were able to work the miracles which they wrought when they were sent forth two and two, and were carried out of themselves into confessions like that of S. Peter. He "was in" them; and after Pentecost He would "be in" them in a sense which would reduce their present foretastes of His indwelling into comparative insignificance.

What the indwelling of the Holy Spirit actually is, what it means to the Divine Inmate Himself, is beyond our power to conceive. We only know, from what He reveals to us, that the connexion is so close that His own person is deeply affected by it. The sins and the successes of those in whom He dwells mean more to Him than those of others. Thus we feel the force of the apostolic appeals; "Do ye not know that your body is a temple of that Holy Ghost

which is in you, which ye possess from God? glorify God then in your body" (1 Cor. vi. 19); "Let no corrupt speech proceed out of your mouth, and grieve not the Holy Spirit of God in whom ye were sealed unto a day of redemption" (Eph. iv. 29, 30); "Whosoever chooseth to be a friend of the world, is made an enemy of God; or do ye think that the Scripture saith in vain, 'Even unto envy the Spirit which He made to dwell in us longeth'" (S. James iv. 5)?

Looking at the matter from the human point of view, it is more easy to feel than to explain what is meant by speaking of that which takes place, or subsists, "in" a personal being. Sometimes the material body may be thought of as the outer circle inside of which it takes place: "his life is in him," "the spirit of a man which is in him." But the New Testament makes use of the expression in a great variety of ways. Thus we read very frequently of that which a man says, or reasons, or doubts, or wonders, or believes, or judges, or perceives, "within" himself, or "in his heart." Movements of this internal world are expressed in such phrases as those which tell us that S. Paul's spirit was "provoked in him" at the sight of the idolatries of Athens (Acts xvii. 16), and that Jesus groaned, or whatever may be the meaning of the mysterious word, "within Himself" (John xi. 38) on the way to the grave of Lazarus, and that we too have to groan "within ourselves" (Rom. viii. 23). A whole inner life of intelligence and feeling, and conscience and will, comes before us, when we think of phrases like the following: "The light that is

in thee" (Luke xi. 35); "ye have not life in yourselves" (John vi. 53); "He knew what was in man" (John ii. 25); "in whom is no guile" (John i. 48); "there is no unrighteousness in Him" (John vii. 18); "he hath nothing in Me" (John xiv. 30); "the unfeigned faith that is in thee, which dwelt first in thy grandmother Lois" (2 Tim. i. 5); "that My joy may abide in you" (John xv. 11); or, "the truth is not in him" (1 John ii. 4); "this knowledge is not in all men" (1 Cor. viii. 7); "the ignorance that is in them" (Eph. iv. 18); "how abideth the love of God in him" (1 John iii. 17)? So we read of that which, because it resides in a man, comes "out" of him; "the things which proceed forth out of the man are those which defile the man; for from within, out of the man's heart, proceed forth evil thoughts" (Mark vii. 15, 21). These words tell us about the *contents* of the man; they do not exactly describe component parts of him, but rather the kind of things which are admitted within the sphere of his being. Thus the word of God, coming from without, is said to find an entrance and a home within a man. Lydia's heart was "opened" by the Lord, to give heed to the things which were spoken by Paul (Acts xvi. 14). S. Paul exhorts us to let "the word of Christ dwell richly in" us (Col. iii. 16); our Lord accuses the Jews that His word "maketh no way in" them (John viii. 37), and that they have not God's word "abiding in" them (John v. 38). S. Paul thanks God that His word "worketh in" those that believe at Thessalonica (1 Thess. ii. 13). But it is not only thoughts

and words which enter thus from without into men and dwell and work there. Other influences, less directly appealing to the intellect, are spoken of as fastening upon men, and centering in them, and using them as agents and mouthpieces. "He is risen from the dead himself; and for this reason the miraculous powers work in him" (*αἱ δυνάμεις ἐνεργοῦσιν ἐν αὐτῷ* Matt. xiv. 2). "Sin, taking occasion by the commandment, wrought in me all manner of concupiscence" (Rom. vii. 8). "It is no longer I that work it, but sin that dwelleth in me" (Rom. vii. 17, 20). "Death worketh in us, but life in you" (2 Cor. iv. 12). And so, almost passing from a personification to the action of a personal agent, we have such expressions as these: "the spirit that now worketh in the sons of disobedience" (Eph. ii. 2); "according to the power that worketh in us" (Eph. iii. 20); "according to His working, which worketh in me mightily" (Col. i. 29).

These last words conduct us to those passages which speak of the direct interposition of other beings, good and bad, in the internal affairs of the human agent. Such language is used of all the persons of the Blessed Trinity. "It is God that worketh all things in all of them" (1 Cor. xii. 6); "it is God that worketh in you both the willing and the working" (Phil. ii. 13). "Ye seek a proof of the Christ that speaketh in me" (2 Cor. xiii. 3). "It is not ye that speak, but the Spirit of your Father that speaketh in you" (Matt. x. 20).

From this interposition in a man's internal affairs

it is an easy step to a positive entrance and inhabitation. Sometimes this language is used of evil spirits. Not every influence of an evil spirit, not the first nor the second injection of a bad thought or desire, not the haunting design and ever-present solicitation, not even the successful formation of a sinful habit or the establishment of a sinful principle of action, constitutes that dreadful connexion between devil and man which is commonly described under the term of possession. Possession is the climax of a long series of preparatory operations. A whole treasury of evil influences has been expended upon the disintegration of the man before he lies open to this final irruption and invasion. When Judas has allowed himself to become sufficiently tractable, then, "after the sop"—the eye of S. John could discern the very moment—"Satan entered into him" (John xiii. 27).[1] Such an "entrance" established a new and definite connexion. "They enter in and dwell there" (S. Matt. xii. 45). The man can be described as "the man in whom the evil spirit was" (Acts xix. 16). In the fearfully graphic language of our Lord, the evil spirit says, "I will return into my house" (S. Matt. xii. 44). And as the forming of this connexion takes place at a definite moment, so, if severed again at all, it is severed again at a definite moment, when the stronger power comes to the rescue. "Thou dumb and deaf spirit, it is I that command thee, come forth out of him, and never enter into him again" (Mark ix. 25). It is not the gradual advance and the

[1] The language of S. Luke xxii. 3 is more general.

gradual receding of an uniform influence; there is a distinct act of occupation and a distinct act of expulsion,—the former the result of a previous siege, the latter, it may be, followed by many efforts to regain,—perhaps effectual efforts; but the possession itself is something quite different from the influence before and after.

The man in whom the evil spirit dwells is said to "have," to possess, an evil spirit. The phrase is not found in the New Testament in the other direction:—we do not read of the evil spirit "possessing," or having, the man,[1] though such an expression is justified by the facts; but men are very frequently spoken of in the four Gospels and the Acts as "having" evil spirits. "He hath Beelzebul" (Mark iii. 22); "the man who had had the Legion" (Mark v. 15); "a man that had a dumb spirit" (Mark ix. 17); "a man having a spirit of an unclean demon" (Luke iv. 33); "that had demons a long time" (Luke viii. 27); "a woman having a spirit of infirmity" (Luke xiii. 11); "a maidservant having a Python spirit" (Acts xvi. 16). To "have" such a spirit may perhaps be an expression of the same kind as to "have" a fever or a palsy, for assuredly the man does not possess the evil spirit in the sense of governing it; but it is the correlative phrase to those which speak of the evil spirits as dwelling in the man. And so we read also of men being "in" the evil spirit. "There was there in their synagogue a man in an unclean spirit"

[1] The expression in the English version, "possessed of devils," is a paraphrase of a single Greek word, meaning "demoned."

(Mark i. 23); "there met Him out of the tombs a man in an unclean spirit" (Mark v. 2). This again may be borrowed from the natural language in which we speak of a person "in" a disease;—"a woman in an issue of blood" (Mark v. 25), or the like; but for a man to be "in an unclean spirit" is a description of the same state as that of an unclean spirit "being in" a man. The indwelling is, in a manner, reciprocal.

The same language is used—to compare light with darkness and life with death—of the relation of man to God. Men are said not only to speak and act, but also to "be in" the Spirit;—not only "praying in the Holy Ghost" (Jude 20); "no man can say that Jesus is the Lord but in the Holy Ghost" (1 Cor. xii. 3); but also, "I found myself in the Spirit on the Lord's day" (Rev. i. 10); "ye are not in the flesh, but in the Spirit, if indeed the Spirit of God dwelleth in you" (Rom. viii. 9). And as men are said to have "had" evil spirits, so are we said to "have" the Spirit of God. "Now if any have not the Spirit of Christ, that man is not His" (Rom. viii. 9); "having not the Spirit" (Jude 19); "I think also that I have the Spirit of God" (1 Cor. vii. 40); "having the same Spirit of faith" (2 Cor. iv. 13); "your body is a temple of the Holy Ghost that is in you, which ye have from God" (1 Cor. vi. 19). It is not said of the Holy Ghost, any more than of the evil spirits, that He has, or possesses, us; but to "have" the Spirit of God involves a kind of mutual possession. It expresses a relationship to Him which in some respects resembles the relationship of the demoniac to the un-

clean spirit which is in him. The possession assuredly does not imply, in this case more than in the other, such a possession as Simon Magus coveted, where the blessed gift might be the tool and stock-in-trade of its possessor, to be employed at will, as a Prospero employs an Ariel; but it answers to that "giving" of the Holy Spirit of which the New Testament is so full; and it is only applicable to those in whom the Holy Spirit "dwells."

This last, most precious word is used far more frequently of the Divine relationship to us than of the hateful connexion with evil spirits with which I am comparing it. As with the evil spirits, so with the Divine;—it is not His first action upon the heart which plants His indwelling there. His grace prepares the way beforehand, inclining man to open the door for His entrance. Not every good desire, or thought, or habit, or principle, proves the indwelling of the Spirit. He may "abide with" us a long time, before He comes to "be in" us. It is a third, or a fourth stage of His action towards us, when He thus establishes Himself within. He who first gave us life, gave us His prevenient grace, and then the new life in Christ with its higher kind of grace, before He could take up His abode within us. He takes up His abode within us at a definite point of time, and by a distinct movement. The movement is not actually described in the New Testament by the word "entering into" a man, but this is probably accidental. It is generally described as the "coming" of the Holy Ghost "upon" men (Acts xix. 6), or His "falling

upon" them (Acts viii. 16); or from other points of view the occasion on which He thus comes is that when men are "sealed with" Him (2 Cor. i. 22; Eph. i. 13; iv. 30), and "anointed" with Him (2 Cor. i. 21; comp. Acts iv. 27; x. 38; Heb. i. 9); when they "receive" Him (Acts viii. 15; x. 47; xix. 2; Rom. viii. 15, etc.); when He is "given" to them (Luke xi. 13; Acts v. 32; viii. 18; Rom. v. 5, etc.). And the gift is not merely given "to" us. According to S. Paul's language in one significant passage it is given "into" us:—"He therefore that despiseth, despiseth not man, but God, who also giveth His Holy Spirit *into* you" (1 Thess. iv. 8). The Holy Ghost, once for all bestowed in the Laying on of Hands, is perpetually being given, as an ever fresh gift, streaming forth from the God from whom He proceeds, into the inmost being of the believer, according to the saying of Christ, "The water that I shall give him shall become in him a fountain of water that leapeth up unto eternal life" (S. John iv. 14). There is hardly any need to enumerate the passages which tell us that the Holy Spirit—and Christ through the Holy Spirit, and the Father through Christ—"dwells in"[1] the believer, and "is in"[2] him, and "abides in"[3] him, and "rests upon" him,[4] and makes him His temple and

[1] Rom. viii. 11; 2 Tim. i. 14 (*ἐνοικεῖν*); Jas. iv. 5 (*κατοικίζειν ἐν*); Eph. iii. 17 (*κατοικεῖν* of Christ, comp. Eph. ii. 22 *κατοικητήριον τοῦ θεοῦ ἐν πνεύματι*); Rom. viii. 9, 11; 1 Cor. iii. 16 (*οἰκεῖν ἐν*). The word *παροικεῖν* is never used in this connexion.

[2] John xiv. 17; 1 Cor. vi. 19; 2 Cor. i. 22; 2 Tim. i. 6; 1 Pet. i. 11.

[3] 1 John ii. 27.

[4] 1 Pet. iv. 14 *ἐφ' ὑμᾶς ἀναπαύεται.* Comp. Luke x. 6; Rom. ii. 17.

His habitation. There, amidst those things which I have described as forming the contents of the man, He takes up His position. When He has prepared the way for His own entrance by inspiring good thoughts and aims, when He has purified the inward parts of the man by repentance and faith, by forgiveness and regeneration and recreation, He plants Himself within, to continue there, not merely as a thought is there, or a virtue, or a principle, but in the fulness of His personal will, and intelligence, and loving-kindness, and holiness, and power.

The relation of the evil spirits to the men into whom they enter serves as an illustration of this possession by the Spirit of God, but it is not an adequate illustration at every point. Rupert of Deutz, in an interesting passage, gathers up what had been taught by earlier Christian thinkers on the difference between the mode of the Holy Spirit's indwelling in the soul and that of the evil spirits. He is arguing that the Holy Spirit must be God, because our Lord is said to have been "full" of Him:—

"Is He not God of whom the Lord Jesus, who fills all things, is Himself full? Nay, to say nothing for the moment of such a Man as He, to fill any narrower-hearted human being is a thing which none but God can do. Let us say in plainer terms that essentially (*substantialiter*) to enter the spirit of a man is a thing which God alone can do. Created spirit cannot be infused into created spirit, that is, an angelic spirit into the human spirit, or human spirit into angelic.

The one cannot open itself to take in the other, nor can the one enter into possession of the other. Neither of the two has the advantage of the other in subtlety. Both are creatures, both are rational, both immortal. God alone, by nature or essence, is more subtle than either, and can therefore take possession of either. . . . The man who is filled with the wicked spirit is not filled with it in the same way as the man who is filled with the Holy Ghost. For the wicked spirit is not essentially infused into the essence of the human spirit; but creeping in by hidden movements, and being admitted through the orifices of the body, it besets the soul in the soul's own home, and torments it with the scourges of hell, so far as it has received permission to do. Thus a fever, or an over-heating draught, overthrows the soul and destroys the force of reason; but the actual essence of the soul is not filled with the fever, nor yet with the intoxication which filters through the body. But this Holy Spirit, on the other hand, enters essentially into the essence of the soul, and in an inexplicable manner fills it by enlarging it and enlarges it by filling; essentially He 'dwells in it and walks in it'; and this is the reward and the glory which is laid up for the saints hereafter. For in the present state but very few, and they but for an hour or for a moment, are able to realise that essential touch of His,—save that one and only Man of whom it is said in a way that would not hold true of any other, 'Upon whom thou shalt see the Spirit descending and abiding in Him (*in eo*).' This that

we have said is easily verified by the very titles of that Spirit, even by the words, 'The Spirit of wisdom, the Spirit of understanding, the Spirit of counsel, the Spirit of might, the Spirit of knowledge, the Spirit of godliness, the Spirit of the fear of the Lord.' Where do you reckon wisdom and understanding to be, but in the soul? Where do counsel, might, knowledge, godliness, fear of the Lord, dwell, but in the soul and mind? Therefore only this uncreated Spirit is capable of taking essential possession of the spirit of man or angel." [1]

Whether all the metaphysical arguments here urged are capable of being sustained or not, I do not know. They are not all directly suggested by Holy Scripture, which, as we have seen, uses the very same terms to describe the relation of the evil spirit to the possessed and to describe the relation of the Holy Ghost to the Christian. It is, however, reasonable to suppose that a closer union can be formed between God and His creature than between any creatures among themselves. Other points of unlikeness might be observed between the Divine indwelling and the demoniacal, which Rupert has not mentioned. Among other things, we are given to understand that the demoniacal possession is capable of being renewed after interruption; but it is otherwise with the indwelling of the Spirit of God. Nothing seems more surely revealed to us than that the connexion between the soul and its Divine Inhabitant is one

[1] *De Trin. et Opp.—De Spir. Sanct.* lib. i. cap. xxvi. See also Hutchings *Person and Work of the Holy Ghost* p. 137 foll.

which is formed for eternity, never to be interrupted; and that if in any case that connexion is dissolved, it is dissolved for ever. Those who fall away after receiving the Holy Ghost leave to the Church no hope of renewing them again. There is no remedy for the sin against the Holy Ghost. Another point of unlikeness between the good possession and the evil lies in this:—The evil possession, so far as its phenomena are known to us, appears to be always actively effectual, while the Holy Spirit's indwelling is liable to be but little felt,—as Rupert himself observes,—for long periods together, even by those in whom it more or less succeeds. The evil spirit, though there may be occasional stirrings of rebellious regret, keeps its unhappy victim continually under control. When our Lord says that so long as "the strong man armed keepeth his own palace, his goods are in peace" (S. Luke xi. 21), He probably means that the possessed man is untroubled by qualms of conscience about his wicked ways; He does not mean that the possessed man is able to live a life of undisturbed neutrality, sometimes doing what is good and right, while the general tone of his conduct is quietly bad. Though there are lulls and accesses[1] of the malignant energy, yet the thraldom seems to be continuous. If the possessed is not always doing deeds of outrageous wickedness upon others or upon himself, yet he remains always deaf and dumb, or

[1] S. Luke ix. 39. Edersheim *Jesus the Messiah* vol. i. 480 foll. takes a different view of the relationship, and insists strongly that the demoniacal "possession" was not permanent.

bowed together and unable to lift himself up, or whatever the specific injury may be which his tormentor is able to inflict upon him. The man only escapes into true peace and right action by the excussion of the demon from within him. But the indwelling of the Holy Spirit leaves a greater freedom to the human personality which is its shrine; and at the same time the Holy Spirit is more tenacious of His hold. Not every sin that the Christian falls into, drives out the indwelling Spirit. He does not compel the man in whom He is, to be uniformly conscious of His sway. There are times when the man who has received the Holy Ghost may fall into sin, even into a course of sin, utterly contrary to the mind and will of the indwelling Spirit, and yet may not be deprived of that long-suffering and merciful presence. To quote once more the words of S. Basil, the Holy Spirit "seems in a way to be present with those who have once been sealed, awaiting their conversion and subsequent salvation."[1] Assuredly the language of Origen is not supported by the language of Scripture, when he teaches—though with his characteristic modesty and absence of dogmatism—that the presence of the Holy Spirit in us is an intermittent presence, and that not only is He to be thought of as withdrawn during the commission of acts of sin, but as withdrawn also from those acts which it is lawful to perform but which belong to the less exalted part of our nature.[2] Origen himself

[1] See above, p. 357.

[2] *Hom. in Num.* vi. 288 B: *ego autem licet non usquequaque pro-*

supplies the corrective when he draws attention at other times to the transcendent heinousness of a Christian's sin, inasmuch as it is an outrage to the indwelling of the Holy Ghost,—when (without, perhaps, discriminating sufficiently between the Old Dispensation and the New) he reminds us that David, who had formerly possessed the Spirit of God, did not forfeit the possession by his sin against Urias, though he was afraid that he might forfeit it, and prayed, "Take not Thy Holy Spirit from me,"—and says, "The man blasphemes by words and by deeds against the Holy Ghost and His presence, who sins with the Holy Ghost present in his heart."[1] Indeed the words of abiding and indwelling and being in us are misleading, if the relation established is as mutable as Origen's language above quoted would imply.

The difficulty is perhaps lessened by observing that there is a twofold indwelling spoken of in Holy Scripture, of which one is objective and the other is subjective. Thus S. Paul prays for the Ephesians (who had long since received the Holy Ghost, when they became believers[2]) that they "may be strengthened with might through the Spirit of God in a way that affects the inward man, so that Christ may take up His abode through faith in their hearts in love;"[3] and yet the Apostle cannot have supposed

nuntiem, puto tamen quod sint nonnulla etiam communium hominum gesta, quae, quamuis peccato careant, non tamen digna uideantur, quibus interesse putemus Spiritum sanctum.

[1] *In Ioann.* tom. xxviii. 388.

[2] Eph. i. 13.

[3] Eph. iii. 16, 17.

that Christ was not already dwelling in them, when he writes elsewhere, "Know ye not your own selves, that Jesus Christ is in you, unless indeed ye are reprobate?"[1] The objective presence of Christ is there in the Christian, whether recognised or not, unless he has altogether and for ever forfeited his Christian position; but this is a very different thing from that subjective indwelling "through faith," and "in love," which he prays that the Ephesians may be empowered to attain. So, S. Paul urges these same Ephesians to be "filled with the Spirit;"[2] although to the Romans he says, in words which I have already quoted, "If any have not the Spirit of Christ, that man is not His."[3] The Holy Spirit is indeed personally settled within the man, or, having once been baptized and confirmed, he must have ceased to belong to Christ; but the man must endeavour to realise what he possesses, so that every faculty may be expanded and charged with new force by the inspiration which proceeds from that indwelling Spirit. "Now," it has been well said, "our part is to open in humblest faith all the avenues and regions of the soul and of the life, that we may be filled with what we already have."[4] Once more, when S. Paul is rousing Timothy to more courageous strenuousness in the government of the Ephesian Church, he does not bid him to seek some new influx of the Holy Ghost, some second or some hundredth Baptism of the Spirit; he "reminds" him (for the doctrine is one which

[1] 2 Cor. xiii. 5.
[2] Eph. v. 18 ἐν πνεύματι.
[3] Rom. viii. 9.
[4] Moule *Veni Creator* p. 223.

Timothy well knows) "that thou stir again into living flame the gracious bestowal of God, which is within thee through the imposition of my hands."[1] The gift is there. In spite of much unfaithfulness and neglect, perhaps, it has not been withdrawn. Conveyed into his inner being at a definite moment, by means (διά) of the hands which ordained him—for S. Paul is here speaking of the *charisma* or special endowment of Ordination, not of the *dorea* or gift which is common to all whose Baptism is completed —the "Spirit of power and of love and of correction" was still lodged in Timothy; but, like a fire which is suffered to die down for want of fuel or by being smothered, this Spirit was not so useful a possession as it might have been made, and was in danger of perishing out of the soul altogether.[2] In precisely similar manner the Apostle warns the Thessalonians, "Quench not the Spirit."[3] The objective donation of the Spirit to dwell in us is not necessarily followed, though it always ought to be followed, by the subjective movement which alone makes it possible for Him to accomplish the full purpose of His coming.

It is, then, the objective, personal, indwelling of the Holy Spirit in us which is the virtue of the Laying on of Hands: and inasmuch as the objective indwelling has for its normal consequence the subjective repletion and all the blessings which come from the possession

[1] 2 Tim. i. 6.

[2] The language is similar to that of Gen. xlv. 27; 1 Macc. xiii. 7; but in both these places the "spirit" is the human spirit, and the verb ἀναζωπυρεῖν is used intransitively.

[3] 1 Thess. v. 19.

of the Holy Ghost, therefore these further blessings also may be said to be bestowed thereby. A most devout living writer of the English Church uses language on this point which ought to form a strong appeal to certain schools of opinion, mainly to be found outside the Church. Confirmation, he says, "may be viewed, *inter alia*, as the quasi-sacrament of what some Christians call the 'second blessing;' the realisation of the highest life of the new-born soul in the more fully received power of the Spirit."[1] It is so, inasmuch as it conveys the "Thing" (which in this case is more than a thing) from which these inestimable benefits proceed. If it be objected that the Divine gift is too great and glorious, too free in His almighty beneficence, to be thus dispensed and administered and transmitted, by special means and special persons, it can be well answered that the Holy Spirit is a spirit of order and regularity, not of capricious and incalculable movements; and that while the Wind of God "bloweth where it listeth," it is revealed in Scripture as listing to blow in this particular way; and that not only the letter of Scripture, but also the observation of facts, compels us to the belief that the Holy Ghost does not usually act amongst mankind apart from the Church which is His chosen organ. We do not see new Churches starting up—as assuredly they might do if it pleased Him—in lands to which the Gospel has not been borne by men. In reply to the objection raised by many to the work of missions and revivals, as if

[1] Moule *Outlines of Christian Doctrine* p. 256.

it must needs be factitious and unreal because such movements depend upon the coming of a human agent, and do not result from some spontaneous outburst on the spot, a modern writer outside the Catholic Church says that such language is as reasonable as the demand "that your telegraphic message shall be brought to you without the intervention of the wires. The Holy Spirit acts through a medium, the Word of God, and through an agent, the man of God; and it is by Christians anointed and filled with the Holy Ghost, that the Spirit's convicting and regenerating power is brought to bear on souls." Unhappily this writer, with all his spiritual force and unction, is ignorant of the "doctrine of the Laying on of Hands," or in some respects his language, even thus far, would have been different. He mentions, indeed, that, "As with the Lord, so with the servants; they could communicate the Spirit unto others," and instances Ananias sent to Saul, and S. Peter and S. John sent to the Samaritans, to convey the gift. But he adds: "Not to enter into the difficult question of the Laying on of Hands, this much is evident from these instances, that it is God's way to communicate His Spirit through human vessels which have been filled and sanctified for this purpose."[1] The "question" of the Laying on of Hands ought not to be so difficult to men brought up on the principles of the author of the Epistle to the Hebrews; and, if rightly understood the doctrine of it would meet all the requirements of

[1] *The Twofold Life* by A. J. Gordon D.D. pp. 158, 159 (2nd edition, Hodder and Stoughton, 1886).

those who are seeking to promote the life of plenary Christian consecration. It is a great thing, however, that it should be recognised, that the gift of the Holy Ghost, though always "the gift of God" and not of man, is by God's appointment delivered to man by man.

But if the doctrine of the Laying on of Hands, as taught in Scripture and the primitive Fathers, ought to approve itself to men like the author of the work just quoted, on the other hand the Catholic Christian might gain much fresh understanding of this familiar doctrine from the study of the recorded experiences of men to whom the Holy Spirit has been given in a remarkable degree outside of the Catholic Church, as well as within, and in ways less sacramental than the Laying on of Hands. It is no part of the Catholic faith to say that the Holy Spirit is given in no other way than by the Laying on of Hands. Cardinal Manning has remarked with justice; "It is true to say with S. Irenaeus, *Ubi Ecclesia ibi Spiritus*,—Where the Church is, there is the Spirit; but it would not be true to say, Where the Church is not, neither is the Spirit there. The operations of the Holy Ghost have always pervaded the whole race of men from the beginning, and they are now in full activity even among those who are without the Church."[1] We may bless God that so it is; for the sight of the wonderful things which the Holy Ghost has done in and through persons in a position to which so little is promised, may make us consider how great would

[1] *Internal Mission of the Holy Ghost* p. viii.

be the results if only the Church believed her own doctrine of the imparted and indwelling Spirit. Those heights of holiness and communion with God are not the privilege of a favoured few. We are not to be content with a poor level of attainment, on the assumption that the Spirit gives Himself according to no fixed rule, to one here and another there, and that the ordinary Churchman cannot presume to expect such visitations as have been given, perhaps, to saintly Quakers. Nay, these extraordinary manifestations of the Spirit's power are given to show us what belongs already by rights to every ordinary Churchman. Each fully baptized member of the Catholic Church, if he would only wake to the discernment of what he has, may be progressively "transformed from glory to glory" by the presence that is within him, "as by a Spirit which is the Lord."[1] Not all, no doubt, will be empowered by the Spirit to do exactly the same works; but at any rate the inspiration which cleanses the thoughts of the heart, and makes a man love God perfectly, and magnify His holy Name worthily in word and in deed, is the common prerogative of all upon whom the confirming hands have been laid.

It is perhaps unnecessary in a book like this to go further, or to attempt to work out in detail the benefits which may be expected by a soul which comes with right dispositions to be "baptized with the Holy Ghost" in Confirmation. My task has been, not so much to show what Confirmation is in itself, but how it stands related to Baptism. I am persuaded

[1] 2 Cor. iii. 18.

that the main difficulty lies less in defining what Confirmation adds to Baptism, than in defining what Baptism confers apart from Confirmation. Most assuredly it is not to be thought of as a purely external ceremony, in spite of ancient testimony which might be adduced for such a view of it. If we may judge by the natural symbolism of that sacrament, as well as by the plainest words of Scripture, it conveys the washing from sin. As surely, by virtue of grafting us into the Body of Christ, it conveys to us the participation of His risen human life, and even of His Divine nature. And all this is most certainly the work of His Holy Spirit. The new relationship formed by Baptism between us and Christ must needs form a new relationship between us and that Holy Spirit. In a sense we "receive" Him then,—receive Him in a different way from anything that could have been predicated of us before, although the penitence and faith which led us to Baptism were breathed into our souls by Him. His grace acting upon us through and after Baptism and before Confirmation is not merely a prevenient grace, or one that acts upon us from without. It is a habitual grace which enters into the very composition of our being. Yet it remains a fact that we are supplied in Holy Scripture with but scanty materials for defining the benefits of Baptism alone. Holy Scripture does not often deal with abnormal situations; and the situation of a man baptized and unconfirmed,—cleansed from guilt and made a member of Christ, but not having yet received the Holy Ghost,—is an abnormal situation.

Necessity may compel a man to occupy such a situation for a time, when (as at Samaria) there is urgent reason for christening a man without delay, and when those who are empowered to confirm are not at hand; but it is not a situation to remain in longer than can be helped. No man is intended to rest there. The gift of the new birth is, in God's purpose, to be followed as soon as possible by the gift of the Spirit's indwelling; and therefore all the teaching of the Epistles is concerned with those who have received the completed Baptism, not with those who are in the accidental and momentary position of an inchoate and unfinished initiation.

With many misgivings and with the heartfelt confession that the subject is far beyond human powers, we may derive some guidance in the matter of what Confirmation has to add from the recorded effect of the descent of the Holy Ghost upon Christ. Being Himself Very God of Very God, and having the fulness of the Godhead dwelling in Him in bodily wise, there was certainly at no time any interruption of that eternal and necessary relation between Himself and the Holy Spirit, whereby the persons of the Divine Trinity mutually coinhere and dwell in each other. And not only was there always this indefeasible bond between His Divine person and that of the Holy Ghost; the human nature also which it pleased Him to assume was in a special manner under the influence of the Holy Ghost. That human nature had no other origin than the creative overshadowing which came upon His mother. It is only a gloss, but undoubtedly

a true one, which says that in His infancy the Child grew and waxed strong "in the Spirit" (S. Luke ii. 40). It was the Spirit which taught Him those first recorded words in which He spoke of His relation to the Father. There can be no question but that that "advance in wisdom and stature, and in grace with God and men" (S. Luke ii. 52), which marked His sacred boyhood, was the work of the Holy Ghost, "wakening Him morning by morning" (Is. l. 4.), making the "tender plant to grow up before the Lord" (Is. liii. 2). Yet, for all that, there was to come an outpouring of the Holy Ghost upon His human nature for which it was not fully ready till He was "about thirty years of age" (S. Luke iii. 23). So novel and great was the effect of His Baptism upon the human nature of our blessed Lord, that some of the Fathers, as I have already mentioned, dare to speak of it as His "regeneration."[1] It was assuredly no "regeneration" to Him in that sense in which regeneration has reference to a change from the death of sin to a life of righteousness. Yet even here, it may be that as our Lord humbled Himself to make our cause His own, and submitted to the penitential rite as having

[1] See above, p. 261. No doubt those who used this language were influenced by the reading, "Thou art My Son; this day have I begotten Thee." There seems to be little doubt that the reading is a false one; but the fact that it gained currency at all shows what was felt in early times about Christ's Baptism. It should be added, however, that such terms as "regeneration," "enlightenment," and the like, had become so completely synonyms for Baptism, that they might sometimes be applied *per incuriam* to Christ. This remark would not apply to such passages as that of the Alexandrian Clement above referred to, where the text, "This day have I begotten Thee," is expressly quoted, and its meaning insisted upon.

undertaken to be the bearer of our sins, so the washing in Jordan, which He so little needed on His own account, may in some mysterious manner have brought to Him the pardon of those sins of ours. At any rate, no sooner had He thus identified Himself with repentant man and undergone for our sakes the symbolical cleansing which in other cases followed upon confessed guilt, than there burst upon Him from heaven that which profoundly modified His whole human life thenceforth, and imparted to Him, as Man, powers which He had condescended to forego, and which now He condescended to receive.

So blind is heresy, that Nestorius, who refused to call the Mother of our Lord *Theotokos*, as not believing that the child whom she bore was then God, preferred to call her *Christotokos*, because he supposed that her merely human babe was already anointed for the great work which awaited it. And the truth was the exact opposite. The Babe, from the first moment of His conception, was none other than the Eternal Son; but we are not led to suppose that He was the Christ, except by anticipation, until that historical moment when from the rending heavens, and accompanied by the Father's attesting voice, the Holy Spirit descended like a dove, and abode upon Him. In spite of the apparent opposition of S. Austin,[1] it seems clear that when S. Peter said to Cornelius that "after the baptism which John preached, God anointed Jesus of Nazareth with the Holy Ghost and power," so that "He went about doing good, and healing all that

[1] See above, p. 94.

were oppressed by the devil," he was referring to the moment of His Baptism in Jordan. Three special points are noted for our learning in the anointing which was there accomplished upon the Lord Jesus. The central and the chief thing observed was that a new relationship was then established between the human nature of our Lord and the personal Spirit of God. The Spirit descended and abode upon Him. A fulness of personal indwelling was typified even by the form in which He appeared. Unlike the distributed tongues which lighted and sat upon each of the Apostles, the dove-like form suggests the thought of a living integer, not to be broken up and bestowed in a partial manner. Much as the Holy Spirit had already done upon and through the human nature of our Lord, perfectly developing in it every private and domestic virtue, whether moral or theological, He now laid hold of it after a new fashion, to work upon it and through it new results for the world at large. The second point was that along with this illapse of the Holy Spirit the heaven from which He came was opened to our Lord's eyes, never to be closed up again, so that all Divine knowledge which was required for the salvation and enlightenment of mankind was unfolded to His human gaze. The third was a deepened and heightened assurance of that which He had Himself expressed before—the assurance of what He was, and (which is the same thing) of what He was to God,—the assurance that in this hour of His profound self-humiliation, when He dedicated Himself to the task of repentance

for the sins of His people, He was perfectly well pleasing to the Father.

The effects of this new outpouring of the Holy Ghost became at once apparent in the new work upon which Jesus entered. New powers were His; and the Spirit which had conferred them, "drove" Him—"cast Him forth"[1]—with the constraining might which He had now acquired over the willing humanity of the Saviour, to meet and deal once for all with the temptations which His new consciousness involved. From His victory over these temptations Jesus returned "in the power of the Spirit" to minister in Galilee (S. Luke iv. 14). He came to Nazareth; and there, in the synagogue, He applied to Himself the words of the prophet, "The Spirit of the Lord is upon Me, because He hath anointed me to preach the Gospel to the poor," so that even they with whom He had "grown in grace" as a child, "marvelled at the words of grace which proceeded out of His mouth" (S. Luke iv. 18, 22). And as it was with His preaching, so it was with His mighty works. He did not claim to do them so much by the Divine power which was inherent in His person, as by "the finger of God," which is also "the Spirit of God" (S. Luke xi. 20; S. Matt. xii. 28); so that the blasphemy which attributed His miracles to an evil spirit is spoken of as a "blasphemy against the Holy Ghost" (S. Matt. xii. 31, 32). And when it came to the last and mightiest of His works for men, we read that it was "through the eternal Spirit"—

[1] S. Mark i. 12 ἐκβάλλει. Comp. S. Matt. ix. 38; S. John x. 4.

if, as I believe, that is the true meaning of the passage —that He "offered Himself without spot to God" (Heb. ix. 14); and it was "according to the Spirit of holiness" that He was "declared to be the Son of God in power by the resurrection of the dead" (Rom. i. 4; comp. viii. 11). And even after the Resurrection, when He "gave commandment unto the Apostles whom He had chosen," it was "through the Holy Ghost" (Acts i. 2).

There are many reasons for which we must be cautious in applying to our own Confirmation what we are told of the effects of Christ's Baptism upon Him. Not only is there an infinite difference between His person and ours, so that both His previous relations with the Holy Ghost were different from ours, and His capacity of receiving was infinitely greater; but, as I have said before, the Baptism itself which He underwent was in many ways unlike to ours. Yet in the main outlines we may perceive, as the Fathers constantly encourage us to do, the course of our Baptism and Confirmation prefigured in His. The personal descent of the Holy Spirit upon us should open the heaven of spiritual knowledge to "the eyes of our heart" (Eph. i. 18), and should give us that assurance of sonship—that "spirit of adoption"—which makes us cry "Abba, Father" (Rom. viii. 15). Christ was not made the Son of God at the time of His Unction, no more are we; but the Unction for us, as for Him, creates a fresh consciousness of sonship. And it should be recognised that our Confirmation too, like His, is

really an Ordination as well, though of course to a less exalted office. Christ in His Baptism was set apart and endowed with all that was needed to make Him the Apostle and High-priest of our profession. Confirmation consecrates the Christian to be a priest. As is well known, the word priest is never used in the New Testament to describe the Christian minister as contrasted with the Christian layman. It would be a most untrue conclusion from this fact, to argue that there is nothing sacerdotal about the Christian ministry. The truth is that the sacerdotal principle comes in at an earlier point. The Christian minister is a priest; but he is so not in the first instance because he is a minister, but because he is a Christian. There are degrees within the hierarchy—degrees not only of honour and prerogative, but of actual endowments and powers. Each successive laying on of hands, which promotes the ordinary Christian to be deacon, the deacon to be elder, the elder to be bishop, conveys from God a fresh development of the Spirit's indwelling forces, so that the man can do what he could not have done before, and becomes *more* of a priest than he was at a lower stage. But none the less the great division between the priestly race and the rest of mankind begins at Baptism as completed by Confirmation, and not anywhere higher up. No distinction between one full member of the Church and another can be compared to the distinction between those who are baptized and confirmed and those who are not. The baptismal Unction and

Laying on of Hands lays the common foundation upon which all subsequent *charismata* are superimposed, and unless a man has been first confirmed no Ordination conferred upon him is valid. For no new spirit is given to a man in Ordination. He already possesses the indwelling of the personal Spirit of God, and all that Ordination does for him is to extend the purpose and scope of that indwelling to a new range of action. No hitherto unknown relation to the Holy Ghost is instituted thereby; and therefore no new kind of rite is performed over him, but a fresh Laying on of Hands, which connects what he now receives with that which he has received already, as being only a new development—though a most important one—of the gift bestowed in Confirmation.[1]

And thus Confirmation is, as the Fathers always taught that it was, the conferring of a real priesthood,—and not a priesthood only, but a kingly and prophetic priesthood also. Such titles mean a great deal more than a right of direct access to God, or the like. They involve duties on behalf of other men. And the Holy Spirit given in Confirmation is given for a wider purpose than the enrichment and exaltation of the confirmed man himself. He comes not only to fulfil the Lord's first promise, "The water that I shall give him shall become in him a fountain

[1] It is instructive to observe that the use of unction in Ordination is modern (not earlier than the ninth century), local (unknown in the East), and partial (an unction of the hands only). That of which unction is the symbol was held to have been given once for all.

of water leaping up into eternal life" (S. John iv. 14), but to fulfil the second also, "He that believeth on Me, as the Scripture hath said, rivers shall flow out of his belly, of living water" (S. John vii. 38). In touching and beautiful words S. Cyril of Jerusalem sums up the purpose of the coming of the Holy Spirit to the human soul:—"Gentle is His approach, fragrant His smell, exceeding light His burden. Rays of light and knowledge flash forth in advance before His approach. He comes with the feelings of a true guardian of orphans, for He comes to save, and to heal; to teach, to admonish; to strengthen, to comfort, to illuminate the mind, first of the recipient himself,—and then, through him, of others."[1]

It is, as we have seen, a recognised thing among the Fathers to identify the gift bestowed upon us in Confirmation with that bestowed upon the Apostles on the day of Pentecost; and it is frequent among them also to compare the successive steps in the Holy Ghost's approach to the Apostles with those by which He comes to us.[2] To the passages which have been already quoted may be added one from a theologian of the twelfth century—a time when it had become customary to use language avoided by Holy Scripture and the primitive Fathers, and to speak of the Holy Ghost as given in Baptism apart from Confirmation. S. Bruno of Asti, while using that language himself, makes very plain the difference which he felt to exist between the baptismal gift, and that personal entrance of the Holy Ghost into the

[1] *Cat.* xvi. § 16.

[2] See above, pp. 170, 227, 335, 361.

soul which follows afterwards in Confirmation. Having spoken of a kind of entering in of the Holy Ghost at the preliminary exorcism, to cast out the evil spirit which was supposed to possess the natural man,—and of the water in Baptism itself, which signifies the Spirit (though Bruno does not at this point speak of the Spirit being given),—and of the unction immediately after Baptism, "in which a man takes upon himself at once the name and the humility of Christ," he continues:—

"Now only Confirmation remains, which is ordered to be given by the bishops, in which the fulness of the mystery of the whole Christian religion is completed. For in Baptism is given remission of sins through the Holy Spirit; but here the Spirit Himself is invited to come, and to vouchsafe to defend and inhabit that house which He has sanctified. For the Apostles too after Baptism received the Holy Ghost, whom no doubt they had already received in Baptism itself for the remission of sins. For it is not to be supposed that they had not been baptized, when they themselves were baptizing others, and had heard the Lord Himself say, 'Except a man be born of water and the Spirit, he cannot enter into the kingdom of God.' But they received (*acceperunt*) the Holy Ghost a second time, whereby to bind and to loose from sins; for the Lord breathed on them as the Evangelist relates, and said, 'Receive ye the Holy Ghost; whosesoever sins ye remit, they are remitted unto them, and whosesoever sins ye retain, they are retained.' And they received (*receperunt*) Him again once more

on the day of Pentecost, to the perfecting of all virtue and knowledge."[1]

It is, of course, evidently a mistake to suppose, with S. Bruno and many others, including S. Austin,[2] that the Apostles had already received Christian Baptism, in the natural sense of the word, before the Lord's Passion. The baptism which they had administered to others at the beginning of their discipleship[3] was clearly a preparatory rite, more akin to that of John than to the sacrament instituted by Christ upon the Galilean mountain. They had, no

[1] *Tract. de Sacram. Eccl.* p. 602. The words are somewhat amplified and altered from a passage of Geoffrey of Vendôme (Goffridus Vindocinensis *Opusc.* viii.), unless indeed they are taken from some manual which was used by both Geoffrey and Bruno. Nothing of equal vigour is to be found in the other writers of that age, like Hugh of S. Victor, Ivo of Chartres, Honorius of Autun, Abaelard, or Peter Lombard, when touching on the subject. The most original is the account given by the Englishman Robert, surnamed Pullus or Pullen, a friend of S. Bernard's, and Cardinal and Chancellor of the Apostolic See, who died A.D. 1150. "Who therefore receives the Holy Spirit through faith," he says, "obtains Him more fully in regeneration, to possess the same Spirit above all in Confirmation. For this is to acquire the Spirit by steps, as it were, to be advanced by fresh developments (*per augmenta*) in good life. Thus the disciples did not receive the Spirit at a single gift. The Spirit, we may say, quickens us through faith, strengthens us against vices in Baptism, equips us for good living in Confirmation. Faith stirs us up like penitence ('contrition'); Baptism heals us like confession; Confirmation makes us active like satisfaction. By the first, life succeeds to death; by the second, health succeeds to sickness; by the third, energy succeeds to health. . . . Regeneration, begun by faith, is advanced by the water, to be consummated by Confirmation" (*Sentent.* lib. v. cap. xiv). It is very interesting at such a date to find the process of regeneration treated as including both the crowning gift of Confirmation and also the preparatory work of faith,—though in a narrower sense Robert contrasts them both with regeneration.

[2] See Moberly *Administration of the Holy Spirit* pp. 43 foll.

[3] John iii. 26; iv. 1, 2.

doubt, all received the baptism of John.[1] It was the Holy Spirit which drew them to receive it, and which led them after it to attach themselves to Jesus, and nurtured and developed their faith in Him. By this discipleship, they were already in possession of one great benefit of Christian Baptism. Their sins were forgiven; and they only needed to be kept in the constant renewal of this first of blessings. "Already are ye clean because of the word which I have spoken unto you." "He that is bathed, needeth not save to wash his feet, but is clean every whit; and ye are clean" (S. John xv. 3; xiii. 10). Assuredly this cleansing had not taken place in them without the Holy Ghost. And they had not only received cleansing from the guilt of sin; they had been admitted to the title and functions of a new office. "He chose twelve, whom also He named Apostles;" "that they might be with Him, and that He might send them forth to preach and to have authority to cast out devils" (S. Luke vi. 13; S. Mark iii. 14, 15). If the preaching and miracles of Christ Himself owed their efficacy to the Spirit of God with which He was anointed, it cannot be questioned but that (as S. Gregory of Nazianzus says[2]) the preaching and miracles of the Apostles during His earthly lifetime were due to the same power. And more than this. The Apostles had received their first Communion in the Body and Blood of our Saviour before He went out to His death. In many respects, no doubt, that first Communion differed from all other Communions

[1] Acts i. 21, 22.

[2] See above p. 362.

afterwards. But on this we need not linger. Enough has been said already to show that the Twelve were, at the time of Christ's Resurrection, in a position not at all identical with that of the ordinary candidate for Baptism upon the eve of receiving that sacrament. It was possible, as I have said, for Christ to speak of them as already having not merely an abiding presence, but even an indwelling, of the Holy Ghost. It must, therefore, be with reserve that we argue from the experience of the Apostles to that of Christians of later times.

And yet, with all that had been given to them, it is questionable whether the Apostles had received their regeneration, in the specific Christian sense, before Christ presented Himself among them on the night of the Resurrection. S. Peter, at least, appears to teach us that they had not. "Blessed be the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, which begat us again unto a living hope through the resurrection of Jesus Christ from the dead" (1 Pet. i. 3). And if it should be doubted whether he is here speaking of regeneration in the sense in which we commonly use the term in the Church, he afterwards distinctly traces to the Resurrection the whole saving force of Baptism:—"Baptism doth now save you, . . . through the resurrection of Jesus Christ" (1 Pet. iii. 21). It was not their belief in the Resurrection which wrought this effect; it was the Resurrection itself. The Apostles had already been united to our Lord Jesus Christ by faith, and by virtue of that union they had received the remission of sins for themselves, applied

to them by anticipation of His atoning sacrifice, as in the case of others whom Christ absolved. But the actual participation in His risen life could not be imparted to them before He was Himself in the enjoyment of it. Accordingly, it seems natural to suppose that when He breathed upon them on the occasion of His first appearance to the Church after resurrection, saying, "Receive ye the Holy Ghost," it was to confer upon them that grace which He brought back with Him from His triumph over death, the grace of a new form of life, the grace of regeneration. But inasmuch as they differed in three respects, at least, from the ordinary recipients of that grace—namely, in being already cleansed from guilt, already sacramentally united with the Body of Christ, and already Apostles,—our Lord does not speak to them now about the forgiveness of their own sins, but empowers them to forgive the sins of others, and so bids them set forth on the mission to which they had already been dedicated (S. John xx. 21 *πέμπω ὑμᾶς*, not *ἀποστέλλω*). In one sense, therefore, the Paschal gift of the Spirit was identical with the grace of Baptism; in other respects it was different. It had a bearing not only upon their personal status, but also upon their ministerial function. It was neither wholly Baptism; nor was it, on the other hand, wholly Ordination; for they were Apostles before, nor did they yet receive their full endowment for the Apostleship. Not enough is recorded to enable us to say precisely what was the spiritual position of the Twelve between Passover and Pentecost; but it

appears to have been much the position of the men at Samaria upon whom the Holy Ghost had not fallen, but who had "only been baptized."[1]

But if it is difficult to trace the effect upon the Apostles of receiving the Paschal gift alone, it is comparatively easy to trace the effect upon them of that personal advent of the Holy Ghost which was given on the day of Pentecost. It is necessary to emphasize once more that the gift itself must not be confounded with its effects; but our object at the present moment is to learn from the example of the Apostles what the effects should be, upon a faithful heart, of receiving a gift which is substantially the same to those who are confirmed now as that which came then to the Apostles. The symbolism under which the Holy Ghost was pleased to come to them is no less instructive than that under which He descended upon Christ. His coming was "sudden," in order that it might be clear that a novel thing was taking place, and that that investiture with the Holy Ghost which Christ had promised was not to be merely

[1] Rupert of Deutz has the curious theory, repeated very frequently in his writings, that the great difference between the work of the Holy Ghost in the Christian Church, and His work under the Old Dispensation, lay in the Paschal gift, rather than in the Pentecostal. To work miracles and to prophesy, and other *charismata*, were given, as he says, to the earlier saints; but they had not the gift of forgiveness. It is in virtue of this latter gift that the Holy Ghost is called the Paraclete (*consolator*). Yet with what must seem a curious inconsistency, he says that it was not till He came at Pentecost that He became the Paraclete. Rupert holds strongly that it is at Confirmation that the Holy Ghost comes personally to us to be our *tutor* or Guardian—an expression taken probably from "Melchiades," that is, from Faustus of Riez, who in turn doubtless had in mind S. John xiv. 18.

a progressive enlargement of something which they had before. And He came under two figures, appealing to two different senses, hearing and sight. The "noise as it were of a violent wind sweeping along" was expressive, in the first place, of the mighty, though invisible, *power* of the new gift, carrying everything before it; while perhaps the fact that the sound is described as "filling all the house where they were sitting" should be taken to show the limitations within which the Holy Ghost would be pleased ordinarily to make His power known as such, rather than (as is usually said) the world-wide diffusion of His working. It is only in the holy Church that His full presence is manifested; and His methods are intensive rather than (in the first place) extensive. The second part of the symbolism presents a more complex idea. The element of fire, in the likeness of which the Holy Ghost came, according to the prophecy of S. John, seems clearly to denote, as its chief meaning, an *ardour* which was to inflame the emotional part of the nature of the recipients. A further purpose was served by the choice of this emblem. Had the same emblem been employed here as at the Baptism of Christ, the hovering of a single dove-like form over all the company, though it might well have represented the new relation of the Holy Spirit to the Church as such, would have failed to suggest, what is so characteristic of the Christian dispensation, the peculiar indwelling of the Spirit in each Christian individually; while, if a similar form had alighted upon each individually, it would have

suggested the coming of many limited spirits, not the coming of "One and the self-same Spirit, dividing to every one, severally, as He pleases" (1 Cor. xiv. 11). Fire is the best emblem of that which can be divided and divided again without any of the shares being diminished by impartition. No less, therefore, than the dove-like form, it befits the advent of the Spirit in His personal fulness to each believer, while it indicates the "communion"—*i.e.* the common partaking together—"of the Holy Ghost" (2 Cor. xiii. 14). This one and undivided element was seen to "sit," like a living thing, "upon each one of them," which corresponded to the "abiding" upon Christ. It was no temporary burst of inspiration, but the coming of the Paraclete who was to "be with them for ever" (S. John xiv. 16). And the specific form which the self-distributing flame—or similitude of flame—assumed, the form of tongues, was felt to betoken clearly the first effect of the new ardour which burned within the Apostles, namely, to give them such a sympathetic "utterance" as to bring home "the majesties of God" (*τὰ μεγαλεῖα τοῦ θεοῦ*, Acts ii. 11) to the understanding, and the heart, and the conscience, of every kind of men. Irresistible power, and a united ardour for the glory of God and the salvation of men, were thus the chief, typical, effects of the first coming of the Holy Ghost to the disciples for direct personal inhabitation in them.

The symbolism fulfilled itself in the lives of the Apostles and of those who were with them. To contrast S. Peter as he quailed before the Highpriest's

maidservant on the night before the Crucifixion, with S. Peter bearing his testimony in presence of the Highpriest himself and the assembled Sanhedrin a few days after Pentecost, is an easy and familiar theme for sacred declamation. This was one exhibition of the "*power* from on high," with which, according to the Saviour's promise, they were "clothed" (S. Luke xxiv. 49; comp. Acts i. 8).[1] But the "power" with which the Twelve were clothed was more than an inward strength. It displayed itself in outward victories. When we read, "With great *power* the Apostles rendered their witness of the resurrection of the Lord Jesus, and great grace was upon them all" (Acts iv. 33), we are to understand not only the constancy with which the testimony was delivered in the face of a threatening world, but the mighty effect which it produced. It was the same with their immediate associates. "They were not able to withstand the wisdom and the Spirit by which Stephen spake" (Acts vi. 10; comp. S. Luke xxi. 15). The miracles which the Apostles began forthwith to work were another exhibition of the same "power," showing its command over nature, as in preaching it had been shown over the minds of men. And the emotional *ardour*, the fire, which expressed itself at the first

[1] A too close and limited attention to this particular exhibition has caused many mediæval and modern Roman writers to dwell almost exclusively on the *robur Spiritus sancti*—a sturdy steadfastness which enables a man "both to believe firmly and to confess that belief vigorously"—as the great benefit of Confirmation. See Oswald's remarks upon the insufficiency of this view (*Lehre v. d. hl. Sakram.* vol. i. p. 250).

moment in the "strange tongues," expressed itself also in the more valuable and continuous inspiration both of charity and of knowledge, which marked all the apostolic work.

As was remarked with regard to the Baptism of our Lord, so again here there are certain deductions to be made before we can transfer to our Confirmation the results which Pentecost produced upon the Apostles. Though they were not, like the Lord Jesus, beings of a different order from ourselves, yet the function of the Apostles in the world was unique; and the gift which came to them on the day of Pentecost came to equip them for that unique function, as well as for more ordinary duties, such as fall to our lot. It was not only a Confirmation, but (in its spiritual effect) an Ordination also, and an Ordination to something outstripping the loftiest ministries of the modern Church. Two special points of dissimilarity between the apostolic equipment and our own present themselves for remark.

First, it is universally believed in the Church that the Apostles were inspired in so plenary a sense that they not only were "infallible," that is, incapable of teaching error in the name of truth, but were also able, collectively if not individually,[1] to set forth the entire sum of truth—of that truth, namely, which it is necessary for the spiritual and moral welfare of mankind to know. I cannot do better here than quote the words of Dr. Dale, the eminent Congregationalist minister at Birmingham. "To the Apostles,"

[1] See Moberly *Administration of the Spirit* p. 68 foll.

he says, "inspiration was given in an exceptional measure. They were appointed by the Lord Jesus Christ to lay the foundations of the Christian Church. They had authority to teach all nations in His name. Later ages were to learn His mind from their lips. Theirs was a position of unique responsibility, and their qualifications were unique; for in the Divine order the measures of human duty and the measures of strength conferred for the discharge of it are always equal. That the Apostles were inspired as other men are not, requires no external proof. The proof that an exceptional illumination was given to them appears in what they saw of God and the thoughts of God. Their writings are bright with a glory which rests on no other books. For eighteen centuries saintly men, themselves taught of the Holy Ghost, have striven—many of them with all the vigour of genius and all the resources of learning, and with the fresh aids to Christian thought which have come from Christian history and the development of the Christian life under new and unexpected conditions,—they have striven, I say, to reach the frontiers of that truth which the Apostles knew and of which the Apostles wrote, and they have confessed that at point after point their strength failed, and that the Apostles had passed into regions which lay beyond them."[1] Sometimes, by the power of the Holy Spirit within them, they received the revelation

[1] *Lectures on the Ephesians* p. 138. I should wish to draw attention to the whole of the noble lecture from which this passage is taken

of specific facts which would otherwise have remained unknown to them, or which it was important that they should learn in this way and no other; as S. Paul tells us that he learned the gospel of the institution of the Eucharist (1 Cor. xi. 23); or as S. Peter learned the equality of all nations in regard to the spiritual privileges of the Church (Acts x. 19). At other times, by the power of the same Spirit, they saw, as others did not see, the significance of facts which were within the reach of all.

And secondly, the Apostles,—and not they only, but also many, though not all, of the Christians of their time,—exercised a great variety of *charismata*, or spiritual gifts, which are now no longer commonly exercised in the Church, and have not been commonly exercised in the Church during almost the whole course of its history. Great difficulties, as is well known, beset the investigation of the nature of those gifts, especially as regards the nature of the gift of tongues. But whatever these gifts were or were not, it is plain that they are not among those effects of the indwelling Spirit which were intended to be common to all full members of the body of Christ. S. Paul, while he "thanks God" for the abundant possession of even the least useful of these gifts (1 Cor. xiv. 18), and cannot therefore be accused of disparaging them, yet treats some of them as having comparatively little value, and looks forward without anxiety to a time when they should have accomplished their purpose and disappeared (1 Cor. xiii. 8).[1] This time, as it

[1] It is fair, however, to say that the Apostle is perhaps here looking

seems, has long since come. To have such exhibitions of the Spirit's indwelling amongst us now would be an embarrassment rather than a help. Miracles appear to be a mode of signalising a new epoch in the Divine order, and of displaying, as in an acted parable, some of its characteristic purposes; they seem never to be intended to be a normal part of the Spirit's action, in normal times. If these gifts are no longer exercised amongst us, we are not bound to bewail the fact, as if it were a proof of spiritual degeneracy. As we no longer need, in the modern Church, men possessed of the Apostles' plenary and infallible inspiration, because the Apostles' function in that respect has been perfectly performed once for all, so is it also with some of those special *charismata* which formed a salient feature in the life of the early Church. The men of that day, both Apostles and others, had a work to do in the world which we are not called upon to do, and therefore the one great Gift which is common to all full Christians manifested itself in them in ways which would not suit us now. The Holy Spirit, with His eternal freshness of life, does not cramp Himself by obsolete and antiquated methods of action.[1]

forward not so much to the full grown state of the Church on earth, as to the time when we "shall know even as we were known."

[1] I find it hard to reconcile my friend Mr. Moule's excellent words quoted on p. 449, with those in which, on the previous page of his book, he had described the Apostles' Laying on of Hands as conveying "(not the graces of faith, hope, and love, but) the miraculous *charismata*" (*Outlines of Christian Doctrine* p. 255; comp. p. 143). What resemblance is there between "the realisation of the highest life of the newborn soul in the more fully received power of the

If it be, then, the gift of the indwelling of the personal Spirit of God Himself which is vouchsafed to us in Confirmation, we may expect that the way in which He will work in us will be such as to enable us to accomplish well the special vocation to which each of us is called as He enabled those of old. "The first and chiefest effect of Confirmation," says a careful theologian, "is this, that it invests the Christian with habitual grace and all actual graces, to rise to that vocation which God has assigned to him in Church

Spirit," and the gift of some miraculous display unaccompanied by faith, hope, and love? It is, to my mind, impossible, as I have said above, p. 31, that the inspired writers, and the inspired agents, of the first days should have made so much of Confirmation, if all that it had to convey was a transient *charisma* or two. There is nothing whatever in the Acts or elsewhere to warn us that "Holy Spirit" or "the Holy Ghost" means something different in the places where the Laying on of Hands is mentioned from what it means elsewhere. Are we to think that the advent at Pentecost brought no new relation with the Comforter Himself, but only a gift of tongues or the like, because speaking with tongues was the first evident token of His having come? If this would be unreasonable, why is it more reasonable in the case of the Confirmations at Samaria or Ephesus? The only passage that I know of which might lend colour to this view is one which I have never seen quoted for the purpose of supporting it,—where S. Paul says that he wishes to go to Rome "that I may impart to you some spiritual gift, to the end ye may be strengthened" (Rom. i. 11). It is exceedingly improbable that the Roman Christians had not received the Laying on of Hands, and S. Paul treats them as possessing the Holy Ghost (*e.g.* chap. viii.); but apparently they did not yet abound, like the Corinthian Church, in spiritual gifts. How was S. Paul going to "impart" them? Quite possibly by some additional Laying on of Hands, such as we receive in Ordination. But S. Paul does not say, "that I may impart unto you the Holy Ghost," as he probably would have done, if in his time the gifts of tongues, and so forth, were usually held to constitute the receiving of the Holy Ghost. At the same time, it is quite true that the Laying on of Hands does "not convey the graces of faith, hope, and love;" but it conveys, as S. Paul might say (see 2 Tim. i. 6, 7), "the *Spirit* of faith, hope, and love," to be welcomed and kept alive within.

and State, and to reach the eternal glory appointed for him by God. . . . To maintain that Confirmation is the completion of Baptism means, in other words, that it gives a man the grace to fulfil his calling as a Christian in general, and as a Christian in his own peculiar position and relationships. The Christian must, as far as ever he can, be active for the kingdom of Christ both by example and by word, and even offer himself in sacrifice in this cause. . . . By means of Confirmation the Christian is to be enlightened and empowered, not only to repel attacks upon the kingdom of God, but also to extend that kingdom. . . . Confirmation gives courage, boldness, and determination to work for Christ and His kingdom in the sphere intrusted to us. It gives steadfastness (*robur spiritus*) in difficult circumstances and situations. . . . It gives the grace to stand firm in the true confession of the doctrine of Christ, against the solicitations and enchantments of the world, its pleasures, honours, and riches, which exercise so mighty an influence over every one. Especially is grace imparted through this sacrament to the young man and the maiden, to preserve faith and innocence in the perilous time of transition out of childhood into youth. . . . All these graces, which Confirmation imparts, Holy Scripture, tradition, and Church language, denote collectively by the expression, 'receiving the Holy Ghost.' . . . This does not mean that sanctifying grace and the Holy Ghost are one and the same thing; but the Holy Ghost is the *principle* of sanctifying grace."[1]

[1] Friedhoff *Kathol. Dogm.* p. 916 foll. See also the excellent

Chief among the graces which we all need for the fulfilment of our vocation in Church and State are those seven graces which are enumerated in the ancient Confirmation Prayer. Whatever be the history of the reading in the Septuagint and Vulgate translation of Isaiah xi. 3,—whether it represents an earlier text than our present Hebrew, or is a not wholly impossible attempt to render the same,—at

remarks of Oswald *Dogmat. Lehre v. d. hl. Sakram.* vol. i. p. 280. It may seem to be required of me that I should say something concerning the age at which Confirmation should be administered; but I do so with much hesitation. If the gift given in Confirmation be indeed, as all antiquity goes to prove, the personal indwelling of the Giver Himself, and not merely a specific power or group of powers, then infancy is doubtless as capable of receiving it as maturity is. So far as I am aware, there is no trace in ancient days of the Baptism of little children which was not followed up by Confirmation either at the time, or, in case of Baptisms hastened by danger, at the earliest possible opportunity. But on the other hand, the most characteristic purposes for which the Holy Ghost enters into souls appear to be chiefly connected with full age, and with the taking of the appointed station in the Christian polity. Many of the Spirit's gifts would be of little use to the babe. It seems therefore not unreasonable to defer the bestowal of them till they are actually wanted. Moreover it will be observed by those who study the matter, that the Baptism of infants was practically rare in the early Church, although theoretically it was considered the proper thing to do, and although the few who demurred to it for doctrinal reasons, like Tertullian or the Pelagians, did so for reasons wholly unlike those which move the modern opponents of the practice. The significance of this rarity of infant Baptism in early days was pointed out to me by the present Bishop of Durham. So great a change having come about with regard to the recipients of Baptism, it is at least excusable that it should have been followed by a division between the two parts of the sacrament, so that the gift of the Holy Ghost should be bestowed only upon those who give evidence that their Baptism has taken effect. If the two parts of the sacrament must needs be celebrated at once, I would shelter myself under the authority of S. Gregory the Divine (*Orat.* xl. p. 658), and advise rather the postponement of Baptism, as a rule, till years of discretion (using that expression in its strict sense), than the administration of Confirmation, as a rule, to infants.

any rate the sevenfold title there given to the Spirit which was to rest upon our Lord is a title well befitting those "seven Spirits which are before the throne" of God (Rev. i. 4), those "seven eyes of the Lord which run to and fro through the whole earth," and which were all "upon" that "one stone" laid for the prophet to consider (Zech. iv. 10; iii. 9). We dare to pray that He who rested upon the Branch which grew out of the roots of Jesse may rest also upon us with the same seven characteristic effects,—the Spirit of Wisdom and Understanding, the Spirit of Counsel and Might, the Spirit of Knowledge and true Godliness, and the Spirit of the holy Fear of God. It has been for centuries an inexhaustible interest to theologians to draw out the meaning of these seven gifts, and to group them in their exact relations to each other. This I shall not attempt to do afresh. I will only point out that none of the gifts are directly gifts of moral virtue. They are gifts which set a man in a position to acquire moral virtues, and incline him to practise them; but they do not in any way supply him with virtues ready-made, or relieve their possessor from the necessity of carefully forming right habits of action and feeling. It seems that all the sanctifying work of the Holy Ghost is done by an inward *teaching*, which commends to us the true principles of moral choice, and an inward *strengthening*, by which the forces of Christ are imparted to us, that we may act, and act perseveringly, upon the convictions which the Holy Ghost has wrought in us.[1]

[1] Similar titles are found also in other passages of the Old Testa-

Perhaps it may suggest to some a fresh train of inquiry and meditation if, instead of examining again the *sacrum septenarium* of Old Testament prophecy, I point to the expressions in the New Testament which tell us what the Holy Spirit is the Spirit of, or, in some cases I should rather say, what He breathes a spirit of. These titles of the Spirit, or of His special and characteristic motions, are eleven in number; and without artificial forcing they may be arranged in three groups of three, with one title to preface the series, and one to close it. Amongst them, these titles fairly cover the whole ordinary action of the Spirit dwelling in the Christian soul.

To begin with, He is "the Spirit, that Holy Spirit, of Promise" (*τὸ πνεῦμα τῆς ἐπαγγελίας τὸ ἅγιον* Eph. i. 13). Such He is, most explicitly, as having been promised by Jesus Christ; more distantly, as having been promised in great typical prophecies of the Old Testament (Joel ii. 28; Jer. xxxi. 31; Ezek. xxxvi. 25; and elsewhere). But the meaning of the title is not to be confined to one or more verbal promises, like these. All God's previous dealings with the human race were an age-long promise of the coming of the Holy Ghost. Even the Incarnation of the Son, His atoning Passion, His Resurrection and Ascension,

ment: "the spirit of wisdom," Ex. xxviii. 3; xxxi. 3; xxxv. 29; Deut. xxxiv. 9: "the spirit of judgment and the spirit of burning," Is. iv. 4 (comp. xxviii. 6): "the spirit of grace and of supplications," Zech. xii. 10: "the holy spirit of discipline (*παιδείας*)," Wisd. i. 5: "the spirit of understanding," Ecclus. xxxix. 6. To these may be added from the Septuagint *πνεῦμα σοφίας καὶ αἰσθήσεως* Ex. xxviii. 3; *πνεῦμα ζωῆς* Gen. vi. 17; vii. 15; Ezek. i. 20, 21; x. 17; xxxvii. 5; *πνεῦμα σωτηρίας σου* Is. xxvi. 18; but these are not all applied to the Divine Spirit.

were the conscious means to a definite end, and that end the union of God with men through the indwelling of the Holy Ghost. This is the crowning blessing of the Gospel; and if Christ had not gained this for men, the pardon which He had gained for them by His death would have been a comparatively small acquisition. Thus the Holy Spirit is Himself the one great "promise" of God. "I send forth the promise of My Father upon you" (S. Luke xxiv. 49). "Wait for the promise of the Father, which ye heard Me speak of" (Acts i. 4). "Jesus, . . . having received from the Father the promise of the Holy Ghost, hath poured out this which ye see and hear" (Acts ii. 33). 'Ye shall receive the gift of the Holy Ghost; for to you is the promise, and to your children, and to all that are afar off, as many as the Lord our God shall call unto Him" (Acts ii. 39). "That upon the Gentiles the blessing of Abraham may come in Jesus Christ, that we may receive the promise of the Spirit through faith" (Gal. iii. 14; compare Eph. ii. 12; iii. 6). With this Spirit (which is, perhaps, the Spirit of promise in a still further sense, because He is in us "an earnest" of an inheritance upon the possession of which we have not fully entered) the Christians of Ephesus and Asia had been "sealed," "upon becoming believers" (πιστεύσαντες). It is impossible to doubt that the inspired writer here refers to a moment like that which, in the case of some dozen of those to whom he was writing, is spoken of in the Acts of the Apostles, when, after asking "whether they received the Holy Ghost on becoming believers" (πιστεύσαντες)

and finding that they did not, S. Paul saw them baptized, and then laid hands upon them, and "they received the Holy Ghost" (Acts xix. 1–7). It is as impossible to doubt that the speaking with tongues and prophesying, which proved their reception of the gift, was not itself the "promise;" but that when "they received the Holy Ghost," and were "sealed with the Spirit, that holy Spirit, of promise," they received, as we may receive in the same sacrament, a far more Divine gift, productive of infinitely wider and nobler effects.

In the first triple group of the titles which characterize more closely the operation of the Holy Ghost within us, we see set forth the *spiritual status* of the Christian. The Holy Ghost is for him "the Spirit of Grace" (Heb. x. 29); "the Spirit of Life" (Rom. viii. 2); a "Spirit of Adoption" (Rom. viii. 15).

(i.) Zechariah had prophesied that God would pour out upon Judah "the spirit of grace and of supplication" (Zech. xii. 10), by which they would be led to contrition for having rejected and crucified the Christ, and would entreat to be forgiven and restored. These primal convictions and drawings of the Holy Ghost are of the deepest importance in the Christian life, and it must not be supposed that they are over and done with, when the believer has advanced to higher experiences. He still needs the humbling sense of the greatness of the guilt which he has incurred, and of the infinite mercy which has removed that guilt by the sacrifice of Christ. Such thoughts appear to be not far from the mind of the writer of the Epistle

to the Hebrews when he joins "the Spirit of grace" to "the Blood of the Covenant, in which" we are "sanctified"—that is, according to the usage of this Epistle, are purified from defilement. But the title is, no doubt, more general. The apostate who wantonly outrages "the Spirit of Grace" outrages a personal power, which not only led him to that purifying bath by which the Blood of the Covenant became available for Him, but which has ever since resided in him as a source of every unmerited and freely given bounty,—the "grace for timely succour" (Heb. iv. 16), the grace which accompanies and leads the pilgrim on (xii. 15), the grace by which "the heart is established" (xiii. 9), the grace (if the common rendering be right) "whereby we may serve God acceptably with reverence and godly fear" (xii. 28). If in the sanctification, or purification, once for all bestowed, we may see a reference to Baptism, it is natural to see in the subsequent and connected mention of "the Spirit of Grace" a reference to that Laying on of Hands which the writer of this Epistle so closely associates with it.

(ii.) "The Spirit of Life" is likewise a phrase which is prepared for by usage in the Greek version of the Old Testament.[1] There, indeed, as in Rev. xi 11, it does not refer directly to the Holy Spirit of God, but to the breath by which the animal life is sustained. Yet even this animal life is the gift of the "life-giving Spirit" (S. John vi. 63); and it is but a loftier development of the same quickening power

[1] See above, p. 482 note.

when He infuses into us the life of Christ. For, as known to the Church, He is not simply "the Spirit of Life," but "the Spirit of Life in Christ Jesus." Christ "is our life" (Col. iii. 4). It is Christ who says, "I am the . . . Life" (S. John xi. 25). But it is the Holy Ghost who makes that life ours. And the life of Christ which He imparts to us in our regeneration, when by His operation we are first made members of Christ, He continually developes in us by His indwelling, that "having life," we may "have it abundantly" (S. John x. 10). New forces are ours,—"faculties of a future age" (Heb. vi. 5). By virtue of our union with a Second Adam, the Holy Spirit renews, and enlarges, and fills with supernatural energy, all that is good in our inheritance from the first Adam, and adds immeasurably more beyond. Thus we are empowered to do what without such an increase of vital powers was impossible for us, and can cope successfully with difficulties which were too great for us before. The man who cried but now, "O wretched man that I am! who shall rescue me?" can answer calmly for himself, or, according to another text, receive answer from the Gospel, "The law of the Spirit of Life in Christ Jesus set thee—set me—free from the law of sin and death."

(iii.) A third title completes the view of our spiritual status in the Gospel dispensation. The Holy Spirit who transports us from a position of guilt into one of grace, from a position of feebleness and decay into one of life, transports us also from a position of slavish and superstitious service into one of conscious

sonship towards God. "Ye did not receive," on the day of your Confirmation, "a spirit of bondage again unto fear; but ye received a Spirit of Adoption." This is more than the receiving of the adoption itself. It is conceivable—only too conceivable—that a man may be made the child of God, not merely by being so accounted, but by actual injection of something of the Divine nature, and yet not realise the privilege bestowed upon him, nor act towards God in a way which accords with it. He may refuse obedience altogether, like the Prodigal; or he may yield it after the manner of a bond slave. The bond slave (except where some other principle has stepped in to modify his conditions of life) acts under compulsion, from fear of what will happen to him if he disobeys. Grudgingly he performs his minimum of work, and desires as little intercourse as possible with the master to whom it is due. But the "Spirit of Adoption," when it really penetrates the soul of the regenerate man, puts him into altogether a different attitude towards God from that of the bond slave. All is now glad, and free, and reverently bold. "We cry," as men who are not afraid of their voices being heard. It is to God Himself that we cry. And, even if He demand from us a service more exhausting than that demanded of any bond servant, we can still address Him in the very language of the Incarnate Son, as He "cried" (Heb. v. 7) in the Garden of Gethsemane, with the sweat of blood upon His forehead, "Abba, Father" (S. Mark xiv. 36).

This brings us to the central group of titles, in

which is brought out the *illuminating* power of the Spirit. The Spirit is given to us, as S. Paul expressly teaches, for the purpose of throwing light upon all the other bounties which we enjoy. "We did not receive," on the day when the great gift came to us, "the spirit of the world, but the Spirit who issueth out of God, in order that we might realise the things which that God bestowed upon us" (1 Cor. ii. 12). This Spirit who comes to quicken our consciousness of the facts of the Christian life is called "the Spirit of Truth" (S. John xiv. 17; xv. 26; xvi. 13; 1 John iv. 6); He becomes in us, if God wills and if we will, "a Spirit of Wisdom and Revelation" (Eph. i. 17); and He is "the Spirit of Prophecy" (Rev. xix. 10).

(iv.) The title of "the Spirit of Truth" is our Lord's own chosen title for the Paraclete whose coming was to compensate the Apostles, and more than compensate them, for losing His own presence in the flesh. Three times over He calls Him by this solemn title. What the title means, may, as in other cases, be gathered from a contrast. "Hereby," says the Beloved Disciple, "know we the Spirit of Truth, and the spirit of error" (1 John iv. 6). The "spirit of error" is, no doubt, the spirit which sets itself to bewilder and lead men astray; and the Spirit of Truth, on the other hand, is, as Dr. Westcott has said, "the Spirit by whom the Truth finds expression and is brought to man's spirit."[1] It is, at the first glance, a very sobering view to take of the work of the Holy Ghost. He is no inventor of glowing un-

[1] Note on S. John xiv. 17.

realities, but the exponent of facts. He is Himself, even as Christ is, "the Truth" (1 John v. 7). Truth is His very nature, and it is all summed up in His Person; and therefore He is qualified, as none other could be, to "bear witness" to it. "It is the Spirit that beareth witness, because the Spirit is the truth." And this is indeed the kind of inspiration which the Christian man most needs. He needs to be set free from all illusions and vain fancies, and from all inclination to the same, and to be taught the real state of things in which he is, and to prize the knowledge of it. Such truthfulness of disposition is given to those who will "receive" it (2 Thess. ii. 10) by the Blessed Spirit, the Paraclete, who takes up His abode in us at our Confirmation; and to meet the desire which He has Himself aroused, He brings the perception of realities. Step by step, He "guides" the willing learner "into all the truth" (S. John xvi. 13). Things which Christ was well able to teach, indeed, but which the disciples were unable to learn from Him before the advent of the Paraclete, they are now able to learn by the mysterious power of His indwelling without being overwhelmed. The Bible tells us marvellous things of the knowledge which is put within the reach of every one who has been confirmed. "Ye have an Unction from the Holy One and ye know all things. . . . The Unction which ye received of Him abideth in you, and ye need not that any one teach you" (1 John ii. 20, 27). But above all other things which the Holy Ghost teaches, it is His special delight and function to make known the glories of the

Incarnate Son, His person and His work. "When the Paraclete whom I shall send unto you from the Father cometh, even the Spirit of Truth which proceedeth out from the Father, He shall bear witness concerning *Me*" (S. John xv. 26). Whatever else He teaches, He teaches in its relation to Christ. If He convicts of sin, it is "because they believe not on Me;" if of righteousness, it is "because I go to the Father and ye see Me no more" (S. John xvi. 9, 10). "All the fulness" dwells in Christ,—"all the treasures of wisdom and knowledge" (Col. i. 19; ii. 3); and with infinite skill and judgment the Spirit of truth brings out now one part of the inexhaustible store, and now another, to suit the varying needs of the soul and of the Church. "He shall glorify Me, because He shall take out of that which is Mine and declare it unto you. All things whatsoever the Father hath are Mine; for this cause said I that He taketh out of Mine and shall declare it to you" (S. John xvi. 14, 15).

(v.) And because Christ is the great subject of His testimony and teaching, therefore it is that the Spirit of Truth shews Himself as a "Spirit of Wisdom and of Revelation." S. Paul significantly adds to this expression the words, "in the knowledge of Him." It is only in the knowledge of Christ that the perception of the truth becomes wisdom. To travel step by step into all the truth might possibly end only in a vast accumulation of undigested details, like the erudition of an unpractical scholar. But the knowledge—the advancing knowledge (ἐπίγνωσις)—of Christ turns it into a philosophy. It imparts

a majestic unity to all known facts, and shews the bearings of each upon each. And this is the meaning of that wide and lofty virtue which is described in the Bible by the name of "wisdom." It stands related to truth as reflexion is related to observation. S. Clement of Alexandria well describes wisdom as "perfect, being a knowledge of things divine and human, embracing and comprehending all facts in one."[1] Thus wisdom has its ethical and practical side, as well as a theoretical and meditative side. A large and well co-ordinated survey of the system of things in which we are placed shews a man easily what he ought to do, and inclines him to do it. What S. Paul understands by wisdom is well seen in 1 Cor. ii.; and also what he understands by the "revelation" which he joins to it. "But wisdom, —we do indeed speak it among those who are full grown—only not a wisdom of this age, or of the leaders of this age who are brought to naught, but we speak a wisdom of God in a mystery,—that hidden wisdom, which God before the ages predestined to be a glory for us; which none of the leaders of this age knoweth, for had they known it, they would not have crucified the Lord to whom that glory belongeth: but as it is written, 'What eye never saw, and ear never heard,' and never stole over the heart of man,—'all the things which God prepared for them that love Him.' For to us [and not to others before us] did God reveal them through the

[1] *Paedag.* ii. 2, p. 181 : ἐμπεριλαβοῦσα τὰ ὅλα (quoted by Lightfoot on *Coloss.* i. 9).

Spirit; for the Spirit searcheth all things, even the depths of God." This is revelation indeed. The Spirit of wisdom which takes possession of us "in the knowledge of Christ," is not a coldly intellectual thing, nor a coldly practical thing either. It operates by "enlightening the eyes of our *hearts*" (Eph. i. 18); and though the facts which it reveals to us may not be facts hitherto unknown to the Church—for all that is of eternal value has already been revealed once for all—yet it is none the less a revelation to ourselves, every time that the Holy Spirit brings anew into vivid realisation in our hearts such things as those which S. Paul prays that He may bring before the Ephesians, "what is the hope of our calling, what the wealth of the glory of God's inheritance in the saints, what the surpassing greatness of His power towards us who believe."[1]

(vi.) Inasmuch as "out of the abundance of the heart the mouth speaketh," the Spirit of Wisdom and Revelation becomes also "the Spirit of Prophecy." A soul which is on fire with the Spirit's inward disclosures of the glory of Christ, will utter, if it be called upon to utter anything, that which is in the truest sense prophetic. Thus the angel

[1] It will be observed that S. Paul does not pray that "*the* Spirit of wisdom and revelation" may be given to the Ephesians, but "*a* Spirit of wisdom and revelation." A few lines before he has said that the Ephesians had already received the Holy Ghost; what he now prays is that that same Spirit may operate upon them in this particular way, that God may "give" them a particular inspiration of His. There is no instance in the New Testament of prayer being offered for persons already confirmed that God would give them the Holy Ghost. See Moule *Veni Creator* p. 222.

in the Apocalypse tells the Seer that "the witness to Jesus,"—so I take it, not the witness borne by Jesus—"is the Spirit of Prophecy." This oracular saying sets the two things over against each other as if completely identical. It is hard to say which is subject and which is predicate. On the one hand, it was the bearing testimony to Jesus which gave their inspiration to the prophets of the Old Dispensation; and the same gives inspiration to the prophets of the New. And on the other hand, there is no testimony to the power and truth of Jesus like the force of the words which the Holy Ghost puts in the mouth of those whom He inspires. The gift of the Spirit of Prophecy, though pre-eminently the gift of those who are appointed to the office of preaching (1 Pet. iv. 11), is nevertheless vouchsafed in measure and degree, according to the demand which God's Providence may make upon them, to all who are confirmed. The days are come, to which Moses looked forward, when "all the Lord's people" are "prophets," and He has "put His Spirit upon them" for the purpose (Numb. xi. 29; comp. Joel ii. 28, 29).

The third group of titles contains those which have to do more directly with the Christian's *moral activities.* The Holy Ghost is represented as "the Spirit of Faith" (2 Cor. iv. 13); the "Spirit of Holiness" (Rom. i. 4); and the "Spirit of Power, and of Love, and of Correction" (2 Tim. i. 7).

(vii.) Faith is the root of all right moral life. It is only through faith that the graces which belong

to our spiritual status begin to be effectual to our good. It is only through faith that the revelation of truth is able to affect character. To a Simon Magus, so far as we know, were given grace and life and adoption; but if so, they were "received in vain" (2 Cor. vi. 1), unless he repented after history loses sight of him. Balaam and Caiaphas received illuminations and were inspired with prophecies; but they were morally unchanged by them. But faith, laying hold upon the "grace and truth" which came by Jesus Christ, immediately sets up a transforming action upon life. It trusts God, and casts itself upon Him, and seeks fuller and fuller union with Him and conformity to His will and likeness. Now faith is evoked in us by the Holy Ghost—I speak as if we had been reared in ignorance of Christ—even before we come to be baptized; it is not first given to us when our Baptism is completed by Confirmation. Nevertheless, from Confirmation onwards we have the Spirit who is the Spirit of Faith in a new manner, and ought therefore to be penetrated by His influence in this direction to a new degree. It is, as S. Paul says, "the same Spirit of Faith," that we "have," which the saints of the Old Testament had; but they did not possess Him in the same sense as we do. And therefore it is a shame to us if we cannot at least use the same language which they used;—"I believed; and therefore I spake," or to translate more exactly "I believe,—for speak I must." It is not the *fact* of speaking to which S. Paul wishes to draw attention, but the *contents* of the speech. The

Psalm which he quotes is one which expresses a mighty confidence in God, in the midst of dangers that seemed ready to swallow the Psalmist up; and S. Paul, "having the same Spirit of Faith," expresses the same confidence. Amidst all temporal sufferings, we ought to be able in this Spirit, to rely cheerfully upon the eternal, and venture everything upon God and His faithfulness.

(viii.) The "Spirit of Holiness" is not spoken of in relation to the life of the believer. In the one place where the phrase occurs, it is used in relation to Christ. Two elements were observable in Him; the "flesh," which connected Him with David; the "Spirit of Holiness" which connected Him with a higher source and a higher destiny. "According to the Spirit of Holiness" He was "marked out as the Son of God in power, by the resurrection of the dead." It would have been out of keeping with the supernatural sanctity which breathed in the life of Christ, if He had not been signalised by such a mighty display of His relationship to the Father, both as God and as man. But although the title of the "Spirit of Holiness" is only found in relation to the life of Christ, unquestionably the Spirit which was in Him, and which He has imparted to us, is imparted to us in order that He may produce in us the same sanctity. The title is but an august interpretation of that which is the proper name of the Holy Ghost. By the action of His grace, and by the action of His truth, upon the faith which He has established in the Christian heart, He sanctifies

us more and more, making us more and more like to Christ. There are two main aspects of Christian holiness, whether as seen in Christ Himself, or as seen in His saints. The one of these is negative, the other positive. A "holy" thing, or a "holy" person, is, in the first place, one set free from all profane and common uses. There is in Christian holiness a certain standing aloof not only from vile wickedness, but also from many things not sinful in themselves, but not exalting in their tendency. This wholesome severity and deadness to the world is the Spirit's gift:—"If ye through the Spirit do mortify the deeds of the body, ye shall live" (Rom. viii. 13). "Walk by the Spirit, and ye shall in no wise fulfil the lust of the flesh" (Gal. vi. 16.) And on the other hand, Christian holiness goes far beyond a mere abstinence from evil;—indeed abstinence from evil is impossible for those who seek for nothing higher. Holiness implies an actual consecration to God. It is the very meaning of the word as applied to holy *things;* and it lies at the root of the meaning when applied to persons also. By virtue of an initial act of consecration to God in Baptism, all Christian people are now "called saints," as the Chosen People were before, "an holy nation." And this consecration, continuously carried on, and made actual and not nominal only, is the very "sanctification of the Spirit" (1 Pet. i. 2), to which God elected us according to His foreknowledge before the world began.

(ix.) Faith and holiness represent the work of the Blessed Spirit in the formation of the individual cha-

racter. But there is a work to be accomplished through a man as well as in him; a work to which his faith and holiness contribute, and which in turn reacts in further developments of faith and holiness. For this external work of the Christian soul new gifts are needed, and the Spirit who supplies them, assumes from them the title of the "Spirit of Power, and of Love, and of Discipline," or "Correction." As I have already pointed out,[1] the name denotes especially the *charisma* which qualifies a man for the higher ministries of the Church. Yet, as was said in speaking of the Spirit of Prophecy, some measure of this *charisma* is bestowed on every man at his Confirmation; though not all require, and therefore not all receive, an equal degree of it. A "Spirit of Power." The apostolic writers are fond of expounding the attributes of the Holy Spirit by their contrasts:—"not the spirit of the world, but the Spirit which is of God," "not a spirit of bondage, but a Spirit of Adoption," "the Spirit of Truth and the spirit of error;"—so S. Paul says here, "God did not give unto us a spirit of cowardice (πνεῦμα δειλίας), but a Spirit of Power," and the rest. There is no reason why a Christian should shrink from an arduous task, such as Timothy's at Ephesus, so long as it is clear that God has assigned it to him. He has no right to be a coward, for he has received from God a living fountain of superhuman force, which he carries about within him, lodged there once for all by the Divine ordinance which set him apart for his

[1] See above, p. 450

life's duties. I need not repeat here what has been said before concerning the "power" which marks the indwelling of the Spirit. It is the first thing with which He "endues" those who receive Him. But power, by itself, is not always an attractive thing in a man, nor is it the thing which needs to be most constantly displayed in work for the souls of others; and therefore the Spirit who suffers Himself to be called a Spirit of Power, adds immediately, not as a separate title, but as part of the same, though there is nothing in the context, certainly nothing in the contrast of "cowardice," to suggest such an addition, the words 'of Love." Love is never out of place, and is always wanted in Christian work. Mere power might endeavour to overbear opposition; but love is patient, and makes allowances, and devises subtler ways of winning spiritual victories than power could teach. It is not always easy to love; it only comes naturally to us where there are obvious reasons for loving; and therefore He who calls upon us not only to love as publicans and sinners and heathens love, but to "do more" (S. Matt. v. 47), supplies us with an indwelling Spirit who can disclose to us a thousand reasons for loving the most unloveable, with a view to ridding him of that which is unloveable in him. And for this last reason, the Spirit adds another term to the description of Himself. He is the Spirit "of Discipline," or "of Correction," as well as of Love and Power. It is the aim at which He is aiming through both power and love,—to correct, to bring to a sound mind. Whether He is

dealing with an individual man, or with a community of men, with a froward temper or with a false public opinion, He works for the restoration of a just feeling, a sane and sensible and healthy mode of thought and action. But His usual method of attaining such an end, is to inspire some chosen vessel of His with a "Spirit of Correction," which is the resultant of power and love combined.[1]

All, now, but the last of these inspired designations of the Holy Ghost as given to man, have been considered. The series closes with the magnificent title, "the Spirit of Glory and of God" (*τὸ τῆς δόξης καὶ τὸ τοῦ θεοῦ πνεῦμα*). It is what the Holy Ghost is in Himself. As the Father is "the Father of glory" (Eph. i. 17), and as the Son is "the Lord of glory" (1 Cor. ii. 8, comp. S. James ii. 1), so the Spirit who with the Father and the Son is worshipped and glorified is "the Spirit of Glory and of God." To Him, no less than to Them, belongs all that sum of unimaginable beauties, and splendours, and perfections, which is called "the glory of God." But it is not for Himself alone that He possesses them. He brings

[1] It might perhaps be thought that S. Paul's expression "a spirit of meekness" (1 Cor. iv. 21; Gal. vi. 1) should be added to the list. Undoubtedly meekness is one of the precious fruits of the Spirit (Gal. v. 23), and there is no reason why the Holy Spirit should not be called "the Spirit of Meekness." But a glance at the former passage will show that if S. Paul had intended to refer at all to the Blessed Spirit, he must have written "or in the Spirit of love and meekness," rather than "in love and a spirit of meekness." In both places he means something closely akin to "mood" or "temper" by the word "spirit." His own dealing with the guilty Corinthian Church is an admirable example of the true "Spirit of Correction," "restoring" those "overtaken in a fault."

them all with Him to "rest upon" the Christian to whom He has been given. Scorned and reviled though the man may be, a lustre shines about him which is not his own. As he shares the sufferings and the reproach of Christ who died for him, a heaven-taught eye can discern that he is already wrapped round with the brilliancy of another world. "Happy" is he. "The Spirit of Glory, yea"—for there is something even greater than the glory of God, namely God Himself—"yea, the Spirit of God doth rest upon" him. And this is the heritage not of a few heroic martyrs only, at the critical moment of their conflict, but of every humblest Christian who has learned to believe with simplicity the "doctrine of Baptisms and of Laying on of Hands."

May He of whom the blind seer-saint of Alexandria feared to write, lest in any way he should blaspheme against the Holy Ghost, forgive whatever in these pages is unworthy of the subject, and correct whatever is erroneous; and may He bless to the use of His Church whatever can serve to enlarge our faith in Him and in His indwelling.

INDEX.

Adoption, 45, 342
Alanus de Insulis, 426 note
Alcuin, 214 foll., 230
Alexander of Hales, 426 note
Amalarius, deacon of Metz, 220, 234, 248
Amalarius, Bishop of Trèves, 217
Ambrose, 145
Anastasius of Sinai, 383
Apostles, Teaching of the Twelve, 54, 316, 319, 323
Arles, Council of, 132
Asseman, viii.
Asterius, 375
Athanasius, 281
Austin, on the parts of Baptism, 82; on unction, 85; on laying on of hands, 93; on the gift of the Spirit, 107; on Christ's Baptism, 458; on Baptism of the Apostles, 466

Baptism, among the Jews, 7; of John, 24 foll., 123, 276, 368; administered by our Lord's disciples during His life on earth, 466
Baptism, Christian, its value as distinguished from Confirmation, 20, 41, 43, 50, 71, 73, 106, 126 foll., 142, 151, 162, 195, 201, 219, 222, 224, 239, 254, 258, 275, 291, 297, 310, 311, 318, 328, 376, 385, 390, 394, 400, 427, 455; apart from Confirmation, held to be chiefly a benefit to the body, 117 note, 291, 299, 339, 357, 390; a preparation for receiving the Spirit, 37, 60, 73, 224, 257, 275, 295, 302, 353; "form" of, 21 note; heretical Baptism, 66, 81, 123 foll., 186, 190, 192, 331, 355, 383; lay Baptism, 386; "one Baptism," *i.e.* not repetible, 186; used in a wider and a more restricted sense, 1 foll., 49, 274
Baptism of blood, 129, 134, 193; of fire, 134, 135, 222; with water and the Holy Ghost, 428; with the Spirit, not the same as birth of the Spirit, 44 note; identified by some with Confirmation, 126, 428 note
Baptism, our Lord's, 14, 79, 94, 135, 164, 259, 343, 363, 456
Baptism, typical, in the cloud and sea, 40, 361, 375
Barnabas, 56
Basil, 349
Bede, 212
Benedict XIV., ix., 255
Birth, the new, 35
Bishops, encroachment upon the rights of, by presbyters, 203, 213 note
Bruno of Asti, 464

Charles the Great, 215, 235
Chrism, used as synonym for Baptism, 360
Christian, the name only applicable to the confirmed, 344
Chrysostom, 37 note, 363, 373, 390
Clement of Alexandria, 255
Clement, "Second Epistle of," 54
Clementine Homilies and Recognitions, 328, 329, notes
Confessio Orthodoxa, 425
Confirmation, the word, xii., 187, 191, 192; used of the Eucharist, 197, 215, 216, 225; spoken of as a substitute for the laying on of hands, 426 note; a part of Baptism, xiv., 1 foll., 27, 33, 49, 64, 106, 128, 140, 142, 154, 157, 215, 219, 271, 274, 276, 284, 293, 304, 321, 341, 359, 360, 376, 384, 389; not known as a separate sacrament in some Churches, 1, 314, 400, 401; now reckoned as such among the Greeks, 379; "form" of, among the Latins, 248; among the Greeks, 363 note, 376 note, 394;

true "form" of, 429; insufficiency of modern Roman doctrine upon it, 419; modern Greek doctrine, 422; doctrine of English Prayerbook and Articles, 425; popular English teaching, 3; prayer an essential part of it, 18 note, 319, 431 note; minister of, 23, 168, 181, 200, 203 foll., 296, 366
Constantinople, Council of, 363, 376
Constitutions, Apostolical, 319
Constitutions, Egyptian, 250
Cornelius, baptism of, 38; Austin on, 96; Origen on, 278; Cyril on, 339
Cornelius, Bishop of Rome, 118
Cyprian, 64; and Austin, 81; and Jerome, 163
Cyril of Alexandria, 299
Cyril of Jerusalem, 336, 464

Daillé, viii.
Dale, on Inspiration, 474
Denys of Alexandria, 280
Denys "the Areopagite," 379
De Re-baptismate, 122, foll.
Didymus, 290; acquaintance with Tertullian's work, 295; his fear of blaspheming, 500

Elvira, Council of, 131
Enlightenment, 258
Ephesus, Confirmation at, 23
Ephraem the Syrian, 377
Epiphanius, 348
Eugenius IV., 426 note
Eugenius of Carthage, 107
Eusebius, 333
Eusebius of Emesa, 191, 194 note
Eustathius of Sebastia, 356 note
ἔλαιον and ἔλεος, 267, 370, 385
ἐπιπίπτειν, used of the Holy Spirit, 23 note

Faustus of Riez, 190, 415
Firmilian, 331, 355
Florence, Council of, 426 note
Frere, J., x.
Friedhoff, x., 478
Fulgentius, 107, 129 note

Gaudentius, 154
Gennadius of Constantinople, 376
Gennadius of Marseilles, 197
Geoffry of Vendôme, 466 note
Gihon, 9 note, 345
Gnostic use of Baptism and Confirmation, 111, 117, 268
Gordon, "Twofold Life," 452
Gregory of Nazianzus, 359; on age for Baptism, 480 note
Gregory of Nyssa, 357
Gregory of Rome, 202
Growth, the chief effect of Confirmation according to Tridentine teaching, 418

Hall, Bishop, ix.
Hammond, viii.
Haymo, 228
Hermas, 54
Hilary, Bishop of Poitiers, 133
Hilary, the "Ambrosian," 160, 296
Hildefonsus, 209
Holy Spirit, Paschal and Pentecostal gifts of, 16, 107, 170, 335, 362, 464 foll.; works outside of the Church, 453; with and without the definite article, 19 note, 283, 492 note; indwelling of, 434, 440; benefits of the indwelling, 478 foll.; not "given" in Baptism proper, 19, 60, 233, 427; spoken of as capable of being regained after loss, 161, 173, 223, 280
Hooker, ix., 5
Hurter, 419

Innocent, 178
Irenaeus, 110
Isidore of Pelusium, 297
Isidore of Seville, 208

Jerome, 163, 233
Jesse, Bishop of Amiens, 216 note
John of Damascus, 383
John, deacon of Rome, 199
Justin Martyr, 316

Klee, x.

Lactantius, 77
Laodicea, Council of, 363
Laying on of hands, in the Old Testament, 9; supposed to have been used in John's baptism, 8,

372 foll.; in benediction of Rabbis, 10; in admission of a "son of precept," 10; close connexion with unction, 12; retained longer at Alexandria than in other Eastern Churches, 250, 287, 304; Firmilian the last Greek author who uses the term elsewhere, 333; the term revived at a later period, 333, 377, 383, 384, 387, 388; Cyril of Jerusalem avoids it, 341; and Theodoret, 374; Chrysostom appears to make it a different thing from Confirmation, 369; used in a sense not involving contact, 13 note, 305, 329 note; penitential use of in reception of heretics, 67, 179, 186, 197, 280, 329 note, 383; said by S. Austin to be "prayer," 103; used by Gnostics, 269; not intended in the New Testament to convey only miraculous gifts, 31, 99, 477
Leidrad, 217
Leo, 183

Macarius, Bishop of Vinnitza, x. 422
Macarius the Egyptian, 287
Magnus of Sens, 218
Manning, Cardinal, 453
Mark the Hermit, 297
Martinet, x.
Maximus of Turin, 158, 214
"Meaux, Council of," 426 note
"Melchiades," 415 foll.
Melito, 57, 111, 256
Moberly, 466, 474
Moule, 449, 451, 477

Nestorius, 458
Novatian, 118 foll.
Novatianists, did they use unction, 118, 122, 141

Odilbert, 216
Oecumenius, 387
Optatus, 78
Ordo Romanus, 234, 235
Origen, 272, 447
Oswald, J. H., ix., 473 note, 480 note

Pacian, 139
Perfection, 259 foll.
Peter Chrysologus, 157
Photius, 386
Praedestinatus, 196
"Presbyter," used for "bishop," 252 note, 268
Priesthood of the laity, conferred in Confirmation, 11, 176, 462
Primasius, commentary ascribed to, 228
Prosper, 188
Prudentius, 181
Puller, F. W., x.

Raban, 223
Regeneration, used of Christ's Baptism, 261, 457; conferred in Baptism apart from Confirmation, 73, 195, 201, 221, 276, 317; even by heretical Baptism, 187, 190; confusion with regard to the meaning of the word, 74, 232; often held to include the receiving of the Holy Ghost, 75, 80, 116, 133, 140, 152, 175, 190, 281, 284, 288, 290, 300, 353, 357, 466 note; spoken of as a temporary thing, 424; used in a secondary sense of conversion, 376
Remigius, 228
Renewal, 48
Robert Pullus, or Pullen, 466 note
Rufinus, 119, 156
Rupert of Deutz, 443, 470

Sacramentum, used in different senses by Austin, 89; the *sacramenta* of Baptism, 136, 154; *utrumque sacramentum*, i.e. Baptism and Confirmation, 69, 76; four the number of the sacraments, 196, 224
Saintebeuve, viii., 319
Salvian, 189
Samaria, Confirmation at, 18, 70, 276, 366
Sanctificare, in Cyprian, 65; in Austin, 83
Seal, the, what constitutes it, xiii., 54, 63 note, 119, 149, 182, 184, 226, 256, 323, 324, 356; apparently used of the baptismal water, by Hermas, 54; Tertullian,

62; Apostolical Constitutions, 324; Cyril of Jerusalem, 337; its significance, 147, 163, 282, 294, 296, 324, 350, 351, 378
Sirice, 177
Spirits, indwelling of evil, 438
Stephen, Bishop of Rome, 123, 331, 332

Taylor, Bishop J., ix., 381 note
Tertullian, 59; known to Leidrad, 217; to Didymus, 295
Theodore of Mopsuestia, 371
Theodoret, 372
Theodulf, 219
Theognostus, 279
Theophilus, 330
Theophylact, 388
Thomas Aquinas, 415 foll.
Trent, Council of, 415 foll

Unction, among the Jews, 8 foll.; did the Apostles use it in Confirmation, 10; close connexion with laying on of hands, 12; not repeated in Africa at reception of heretics, 85, 104; but repeated in the East, 356, 363; and after lay Baptism, 387; used by Gnostics, 111, 117; its value at first indeterminate in Africa, 63, 68, 80; and at Alexandria, 254, 267; originally the unction in Confirmation identical with that in Baptism, 63 notes, 213 note, 254; later distinction between them, 221, 224, 226; effect of the division, 231; unction of the forehead reserved for the bishop, 181; allowed by Gregory the Great to presbyters, 205; opposite rule of the *Apostolical Constitutions*, 327; importance of præbaptismal unction in the East, 328, 342; "matter" of unction, 80, 111, 150, 266, 267, 326, 381; consecration of the chrism performed by the bishop, 168, 169, 180, 181, 185, 204 note, 225 note, 231, 252, 296 note; in course of the Eucharist, 68, 84; chrism applied by presbyters in the East, 386; its use in Ordination, 463 note

Victorinus of Pettau, 131
Vigilius, Bishop of Rome, 179 note

Water, transelementation of the baptismal, 146, 299, 338, 357
Witasse, ix.

Zeno of Verona, 143

THE END.

PRINTED BY WILLIAM CLOWES AND SONS, LIMITED, LONDON AND BECCLES.

Nazarene Theological College
B01210
WITHDRAWN

Books are to be returned on or before
the last date below

- 5 OCT 2006

LIBREX —

234.15
AUTHOR
M398r
7098
Mason, Arthur James
TITLE The relation of confirmation to baptism

Date	Name
4 APR 1990	Tony

234.16
M398r
7098

Mason

BRITISH ISLES NAZARENE COLLEGE LIBRARY